Calendar No. 493

98TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 98-281

REDESIGNATING PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA TO ALLOW HUNTING

OCTOBER 26, (legislative day, OCTOBER 24), 1983.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MCCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 49]

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to which was referred the bill (S. 49) to redesignate public land in Alaska to allow hunting, having considered the same, reports with amendments to the text and without recommendation.

The amendments are as follows:

1. On page 1, delete line 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

> That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the further designation of preserves in this Act is done in recognition of a unique situation applicable to National Parks in Alaska and does not have the applicability nor is it appropriate in other National Parks elsewhere in the United States.

2. Strike line 3, page 1, through line 4, page 2 and renumber subsequent sections.
3. Strike line 5, page 2, through line 16, page 2.
4. Strike lines 17 through 24, page 2.
5. On page 3, line 1, delete "such Act", and insert in lieu thereof, "the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2371)".
6. Strike lines 16 through 25, page 4.

31-010 O

S31332

7. Strike lines 1 through 13, page 5 and renumber accordingly.

PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of S. 49 as reported is to redesignate lands in four national parks and monuments in Alaska as national preserves to permit sport hunting.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

Public Law 96-487, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) designated 43.5 million acres as new units of the National Park System. 53.7 million acres were added to the Wildlife Refuge System. The National Forest System was enlarged by 3.3 million acres and some 2.2 million acres of BLM lands were designated as National Recreation and Conservation Areas.

Before December 1978, approximately 7.5 million acres of Federal lands in Alaska were closed to sport hunting as a result of their status as national parks or Monuments (Mt. McKinley National Park, Glacier Bay National Monument, and Katmai National Monument).

On December 1, 1978, after the 95th Congress adjourned without completing action on an Alaska lands bill, President Carter designated 56 million acres of national monuments in Alaska pursuant to this authority under the Antiquities Act of 1906. Almost 41 million acres were to be administered by the National Park Service and closed to hunting in addition to the existing 7.5 million acres already closed.

Public Law 96-487 kept closed to hunting some 25 million acres of national parks and monuments to sport hunting and trapping but permitted these activities on 19 million acres of national preserve lands. Wildlife refuges and other conservation system units remain open to sport hunting under the Act.

The ANILCA contains provisions ensuring that hunting-related activities, such as the construction of campsites, location of equipment caches, etc., shall be permitted on all public lands where hunting and trapping are allowed. The Act also provides that the State of Alaska shall continue to regulate the hunting guide industry. Section 1313 of ANILCA specifically authorizes sport hunting and trapping in national preserves.

Sport hunting is not generally permitted in national parks either in Alaska or in the lower 48. Traditional and customary subsistence hunting by local rural residents is permitted in certain national parks in Alaska under the provisions of title VIII of ANILCA.

ANILCA designated some 19 million acres in Alaska as "National Preserves." As defined in section 1313 of ANILCA, a national preserve in Alaska "is to be administered and managed as a national park except that the taking of fish and wildlife for sport purposes is to be permitted under applicable State and Federal law and regulation." Sport hunters in Alaska are not satisfied that the 19 million acres in preserve status is a sufficient allocation of the 41 million acres that were closed to sport hunting by the Presidential order. All of the specified areas in S. 49 were open to sport hunting until 1978 and most are still open to local rural residents for subsistence hunting.

As introduced, S. 49 would have redesignated lands in certain national parks and monuments from park and monument status to preserve status as follows:

Unit	Present acreage	S. 49	
		Proposed national preserve acreage	Proposed to be added to preserve status
Gates of the Arctic National Preserve	7,052,000	1,953,000	4,824,000
Lake Clark National Preserve	2,439,000	1,414,000	1,025,000
Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve	8,147,000	5,825,000	2,322,000
Kenai-Fjords National Preserve	567,000	0	567,000
Aniakchak National Monument	138,000	50,000	88,000
Denali National Preserve (Additions)	2,426,000	900,000	1,526,000
Glacier Bay National Preserve (Additions)	523,000	309,000	214,000
Katmai National Preserve (Additions)	1,037,000	0	1,037,000
Noatak Preserve	6,460,000	0	1,175,000
Total			12,778,000

Legislative History

S. 49 was introduced on January 26, 1983. The Public Lands and Reserved Water Subcommittee held a hearing on April 15, 1983. The Administration supported the enactment of S. 49 as introduced if amended as specified by the Administration. In an open business session on August 4, 1983, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources ordered S. 49 reported with amendments and without recommendation.

Committee Recommendation and Tabulation of Votes

The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in an open business session on August 4, 1983, by a majority vote of quorum present on a motion to report S. 49 without recommendation, ordered that S. 49, as amended and described herein, be reported without recommendation.

The rollcall vote on reporting the measure was 11 yeas and 8 nays as follows:

YEAS	NAYS
Mr. McClure	Mr. Domenici
Mr. Hatfield	Mr. Chafee
Mr. Weicker	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Wallop	Mr. Bumpers
Mr. Warner	Mr. Metzenbaum*
Mr. Murkowski	Mr. Matsunaga*
Mr. Nickles	Mr. Tsongas
Mr. Hecht	Mr. Bradley
Mr. Heinz	
Mr. Johnston	
Mr. Ford	

* Indicates voted by proxy.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The Committee adopted seven amendments to S. 49 as introduced. The first amendment would emphasize that Congress in redesignating national parks and monuments in Alaska to national preserves is setting a policy that is unique to Alaska. Due to the size and location of the national parks and monuments established by ANILCA many traditional hunting areas in and near these parks and monuments were reorganized. Congress established national preserves to accommodate the sport hunter and the subsistence hunter. In S. 49, as reported, lands in four national parks and monuments in Alaska were redesignated as national preserves.

In the reallocation of national parks and monuments to national preserves as designated by S. 49, as reported, the Committee again stated the policy of limiting the concept to Alaska only.

The second amendment adopted by the Committee deletes the changes proposed by S. 49 as introduced to Katmai National Park and Katmai National Preserve. The boundaries and additions to Katmai National Park designated by ANILCA of 1,037,000 acres and 800,000 acres of land and boundaries designated as Katmai National Preserve remain the same as enacted.

The third amendment adopted by the Committee deletes the changes proposed by S. 49 as introduced to Gates of the Arctic National Park and Gates of the Arctic National Preserve. In S. 49, as reported, the acreage and boundaries in both units remain as established by ANILCA, i.e. Gates of the Arctic National Park is approximately 7,052,000 acres and Gates of the Arctic National Preserve is approximately 900,000 acres.

The fourth amendment adopted by the Committee clarifies the sponsors' intent to retain the upper Noatak River drainage in a proposed Gates of the Arctic National Preserve. S. 49, as introduced, would have transferred that drainage from Gates of the Arctic National Park to the Noatak National Preserve. The amendment adopted by the Committee strikes the changes proposed by S. 49 as introduced and conforms to the acreages and boundaries established for Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve in ANILCA and as described in the third Committee amendment.

The fifth amendment is a technical amendment that properly references the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2371) as the Act being amended.

The sixth amendment adopted by the Committee strikes the changes proposed by S. 49 as introduced to Kenai Fjords National Park. The acreage and boundaries of Kenai Fjords National Park remain as established by ANILCA, i.e. the park is approximately 567,000 acres.

The seventh amendment adopted by the Committee strikes the changes proposed by S. 49 as introduced to the additions to Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve. The boundaries and additions to Glacier Bay National Park designated by ANILCA of approximately 520,000 acres and approximately 57,000 acres of land and boundaries designated as Glacier Bay National Preserve remain the same as enacted.

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 1 of S. 49 as reported is a statement of congressional policy limiting the concept of further designation of National Preserves for sport hunting to Alaska only.

Section 2 would amend ANILCA to establish a 1,414,000-acre Lake Clark National Park and a 2,239,000-acre Lake Clark National Preserve.

Section 3 would amend ANILCA to establish a 5,825,000-acre Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park and a 6,493,000-acre Wrangell-Saint Elias National Preserve.

Section 4 would amend ANILCA to change the acreage in the addition to Denali National Park to a 900,000-acre park addition and would change the deleted park lands to preserve to establish a 2,856,000-acre Denali National Preserve.

Section 5 would amend ANILCA to establish a 50,000-acre Aniakchak National Monument and a 464,000-acre Aniakchak National Monument.

As reported S. 49 would redesignate lands in certain national parks and monuments from park and monument status to preserve status as follows:

Unit	Present acreage	S. 49 (as reported)	
		National park or monument acreage	National preserve acreage added to existing national preserves
Katmai National Preserve addition	1,037,000	1,037,000	0
Gates of the Arctic National preserve	7,052,000	7,052,000	0
Lake Clark National Preserve	2,439,000	1,414,000	1,025,000
Wrangell-St. Elias National Preserve	8,147,000	5,825,000	2,322,000
Denali National Preserve additions	2,426,000	900,000	1,526,000
Kenai Fjords National Preserve	567,000	567,000	0
Glacier Bay National Preserve additions	523,000	523,000	0
Aniakchak National Monument	138,000	50,000	88,000
Total			4,961,000

Cost and Budgetary Consideration

The following estimate of costs of this measure has been provided by the Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. Congress,
Congressional Budget Office,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1983.

Hon. James A. McClure,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Pursuant to Section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed S. 49, a bill to redesignate public land in Alaska to allow hunting, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, August 4, 1983.

The bill amends the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act by redesignating approximately 5 million acres of national park lands as national park preserves in order to allow sport hunting on those lands. Based on information from the National Park Service, it is estimated that no significant additional cost to the federal government would be incurred as a result of enactment of this legislation.

The State of Alaska will incur some marginal costs, primarily for law enforcement, as a result of enactment of this legislation, but it is also estimated that the State will receive additional license fees from the hunters on these preserves. Thus, the additional costs to Alaska are not estimated to be significant.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on this estimate.

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER,
Director.

REGULATORY IMPACT EVALUATION

In compliance with paragraph 11(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee makes the following evaluation of the regulatory impact which would be incurred in carrying out S. 49 as reported. S. 49 would redesignate certain national park and monument lands in Alaska to National Preserve status. The bill is not a regulatory measure in the sense of imposing Government established standards or significant economic responsibilities on private individuals and businesses.

No personal information would be collected in administering the program. Therefore, there would be no impact on personal privacy.

Little, if any, additional paperwork would result from the enactment of S. 49 as reported.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The pertinent legislative reports received by the Committee from the Department of the Interior and the Office of Management and Budget setting forth Executive Agency recommendations relating to S. 49 are set forth below:

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
RECEIVED
MAY 25 1983
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

MAY 20 1983

Honorable James A. McClure
Chairman, Committee on Energy
and Natural Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This responds to your request for our views on S. 49, a bill "To redesignate public land in Alaska to allow hunting."

S. 49 would redesignate approximately 12 million acres of specified public land in Alaska as preserves open to sport hunting activities. We recommend enactment of S. 49 with our enclosed proposed amendments to reduce the area so designated to approximately 10.5 million acres.

Section 17(d)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 provided the impetus for designating public lands in Alaska as parks, refuges, preserves and other conservation units. In December 1973, following preparation of a 28-volume Environmental Impact Statement, Secretary of the Interior Morton offered the original "D-2" proposals which included 45 million acres of new parks. However, Secretary Morton also recommended that all park lands in the Wrangells, the Gates of the Arctic, Lake Clark and Aniakchak remain open to sport hunting. Since the beginning of this process, therefore, sport hunting in park units in Alaska has been an accepted management approach.

During the period from 1974 to 1978, Congress considered various "D-2" proposals that had at least one common item: All provided that sport hunting would continue on designated National Park System lands. Unfortunately, this common approach was disregarded in December 1978 when the Carter Administration unilaterally closed 44 million acres in Alaska to sport hunting. This action totally prohibited sport hunting in all of the following traditional hunting areas: Wrangell-St. Elias Mountains, central Brooks Range (Gates of the Arctic), north, south and west of the original Mt. McKinley Park, north of the original Katmai Monument, Lake Clark, and the Alsek River country.

Congress partially rectified this disregard of sportsmen by passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980. That Act created or expanded eight national parks and established two national monuments. Besides parks and monuments, the Act also established several areas as national park preserves in which sport hunting would continue. More than 43 million acres of new national parks and monuments were established, 24 million of which were closed to sport hunting. Prior to the passage of this Act, there were 7.5 million acres of national parks in Alaska all closed to sport hunting.

We are convinced, however, that Congress did not go far enough in undoing the Carter Administration withdrawals. Accordingly, sport hunters in the State of Alaska and hunters from the rest of the United States who travel north to Alaska

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

every year for some of the best hunting in North America have been shortchanged. From a wildlife resource management perspective, there is no justification to prohibit sport hunting on so many millions of acres.

Although the Alaska Lands Act barred sport hunting on millions of acres, hunting by local residents for subsistence was permitted to continue. Hence, in all but two of these park areas (Katmai and Kenai Fjords), wildlife including moose, caribou, bear, and sheep are being taken today within the national parks in Alaska.

It is important to point out that the park lands affected by S. 49 differ considerably from other park lands such as Yellowstone National Park. All the land described in the bill was open to sport hunting until 1978 and continues to be used for subsistence hunting. Yellowstone, as with other national parks in the lower 48 states, has been closed to all hunting activities since it was established as a national park over 100 years ago. Enactment of S. 49 will not affect these parks— we certainly do not propose to change the prohibition of hunting in long-established national park sanctuaries such as Yellowstone. In fact, this Administration would oppose such an effort. Thus, enactment of S. 49 will not in any way impair the integrity of the park system.

We recommend reducing the 12 million acres in S. 49 to approximately 10.5 million acres. We have enclosed a detailed description of our recommendations regarding specific areas. In developing these recommendations, we employed five principal criteria:

(1) Wildlife Conservation. We propose that only those areas where the resumption of sport hunting would have no adverse effects on a sustained, healthy wildlife population be redesignated as preserve. Hunting has little impact upon the land and poses no threat to the wildlife resource when it is properly controlled. Game herds prosper and endure under a program in which regulated sport hunting plays an important role. If this were the sole criterion, we would recommend the enactment of S. 49 without change.

(2) Protection of Park Values. The large size of the Alaska parks can easily accommodate sport hunting without adversely affecting other park values. Nonetheless, certain areas should be maintained for non-hunting uses where areas of high scenic, recreational, or resource values are likely to attract a significant number of non-hunter tourists. We do not believe that sport hunting should be allowed where there is a potential for a visitor facilities site. Lands that would be better managed to protect the aesthetic values and non-hunter visitor use should therefore remain in park status. We also recognize the value of having areas with unhunted populations of wildlife.

(3) Previous Sport Hunting Activity. We only recommend redesignating those areas that have a history of significant sport hunting use prior to President Carter's closure in 1978. All the specified areas in S. 49 were open to sport hunting until arbitrarily closed by the Carter Administration in 1978 and most are still open to local residents for subsistence hunting. The areas at issue provide a very significant percentage of sport hunting opportunities in Alaska although they comprise a relatively small percentage of the land. Lands should remain in park status unless there was a significant level of sport hunting prior to that time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(4) Fairness to all Citizens. Thousands of recreational hunters are being prohibited from participating in their sport on these public lands while local subsistence hunters are permitted to take wildlife. We are not concerned with the impact of the redesignation on the subsistence hunters because they would remain protected by State and Federal law and regulations. Yet, we are concerned that different classes of user groups are allowed to exist because of the Alaska Lands Act. S. 49 recognizes the rights and interests of all hunters and would reduce the inequities caused by establishing special classes of hunters.

(5) Logical management. We believe that discrete ecosystems should be managed in a uniform manner where possible. We therefore are proposing new, discernable on-the-ground boundaries that facilitate logical management and provide ecological consistency.

These are the five criteria we have used to select the areas proposed for redesignation. In addition to describing the areas we recommend be redesignated and providing amendments to S. 49, we have also enclosed tables on the approximate acreage in each proposed preserve and the visitation and dominant usage.

The State of Alaska has an excellent wildlife management program and supports the restoration of hunting to these areas. The management of this hunting would be a cooperative effort between the State and the National Park Service. Enactment of S. 49 with our proposed amendments would therefore provide an outstanding oppportunity to strengthen the Federal-State partnership in wildlife management.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

G. Ray Arnett
Assistant SECRETARY

Enclosures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve

The entire 8 million acre Gates of the Arctic complex is presently open to hunting by local residents from the villages such as Wisemann, Bettles, Allakaket, Evansville, Kobuk, and Shungnak and of course, the village of Anaktuvuk which is within the park. Major portions of the Itkillik drainage are presently in preserve status as well as the lower Kobuk River. Those two areas are now open to sport hunting.

In terms of our five criteria, the entire Gates should be opened if the wildlife management criterion is the only one used. This area was completely open to sport hunting until December 1978 when closed by the Carter Monument withdrawals. It supported a significant number of guiding operations and the area provided high quality hunting for sheep, caribou, bear, and moose.

Nonetheless we believe some very large areas should remain closed to sport hunting. Because of important park values, we propose that two major complexes remain closed to sport hunting. The first area encompasses the actual Gates of the Arctic and includes the North Fork of the Koyukuk River and its primary tributaries: the Tinyaguk River to the west and Clear Creek to the east. This provides a 1.3 million acre park complex with very high recreational value. It now gets significant use by non-hunters and we are taking that into account. Connected to that would be the Anaktuvuk Pass, and Chandler Lake country. The Anaktuvuk area has a substantial percentage of private lands held by the local village corporation and the regional corporation. There have been significant numbers of trespass problems in the past with both the sport hunters prior to 1978 and with backpacking/hiking recreationalists since then. We do not want to exacerbate the existing problems by reintroducing sport hunting. We therefore recommend that the entire area near Anaktuvuk village remain in park status.

Similarly, the same land ownership situation exists at Chandler Lake. More importantly, Chandler Lake is the pre-eminent lake on the north side of the Brooks Range. If ever there were to be visitor development on the north aide of the Range, Chandler Lake is the place. It has been explicitly excluded from wilderness partially for that reason and consequently we believe that Chandler Lake should remain closed to sport hunting.

The other major complex closed to sport hunting is the Alatna River drainage, which is probably the pre-eminent float river in the Brooks Range. This 1.4 million acre unit is flanked by the spectacular and often photographed Arrigetch Peaks, probably the prime scenic feature of the Park and Preserve. The non-hunting recreational values lead us to keep the area closed to sport hunting despite the drainages traditional high quality sport hunting.

We have also proposed that the upper Reed River and Walker Lake areas--which form the primary headwaters of the Kobuk--remain closed to hunting. The Reed River country and the Walker Lake country form a complex on the south side of the Arrigetch Peaks. It provides excellent hiking and non-hunting visitation uses. There are developed visitor facilities at Walker Lake. We would expect the non-hunting visitation in this country to increase over time.

We suggest, however, in agreement with S. 49, that the following areas be redesignated as Preserve. The upper Noatak country is changed to Preserve. Presently over three quarters of the Noatak River is designated Preserve and although there is heavy recreational use of the river there have been no conflicts between sport hunting and non-hunting uses. Moreover, as a matter of ecological integrity, it makes sense to manage the entire Noatak drainage on a uniform basis.

On the northwest side of the park, we propose that Killik River country be designated as Preserve. This area has historically provided some very high quality sheep hunting in the central Brooks range. In addition, there is virtually no visitor use in this area. Frankly, sport hunting visitation will probably provide the bulk of public use. The lower half of the John River country should be designated Preserve. The John River country provides probably the finest hunting opportunities in the Central Brook Range and we propose therefore, that it be designated Preserve. This conforms to earlier recommendations from this committee.

On the northeast side of the park, we want to flush out the existing Itkillik River area which is now in Preserve. The current boundary line does not follow drainage patterns and is very difficult to spot on the ground. We are proposing that the boundary be moved to the south to follow the continental divide which is a logical and discernible on-the-ground boundary, so that the entire drainage is in Preserve.

The last two Preserve units would be in the eastern part of the Gates. We suggest those creek drainages north of Wisemann that flow into the Middle Fork of the Koyukuk which is outside the Park be made Preserve. This is an area along the pipeline haul road and the accessibility would provide hunting opportunities for people who do not have the ability to fly to more remote regions. It does not support nor does it offer any significant non-hunting visitation values.

Lastly, we would recommend that lower portion of the North Fork of the Koyukuk--the area immediately above Bettles--also be designated Preserve. This is a historic hunting area and designated Preserve. This is a historic hunting area and provides excellent moose hunting opportunities. Our recommendation here also squares with actions taken previously by this Committee.

In summary, we recommend that two vast park units totalling nearly 3 million acres--centered on the Gates of the Arctic and centered on the Walker Lake/Arrigetch Peaks/Alatna River country--be maintained. The remaining portions of the unit--approximately 5 million acres--should be designated Preserve, so that the traditional high quality sport hunting that existed in the area prior to 1979 can be resumed.

Wrangell-St Elias Park and Preserve

We will outline those areas where Park status is appropriate and the changes that we are proposing to S. 49.

On the north of the park we are proposing that the Copper-Tanada Lakes complex remain in park status. Although this country provided some of the finest sheep hunting in the State of Alaska and was historically subject to very heavy use prior to President Carter's withdrawals in December 1978, we recommend that this area remain as Park. It has developed visitor facilities and is one of the few areas that is fairly near a road and is therefore available to road based non-hunting visitors. As a consequence, we believe that the future potential use in this area makes it appropriate to forego sport hunting. We have however, suggested one minor change along the road. The current boundary is very difficult to find as it is unrelated to any natural feature. We have suggested that the Park-Preserve boundary be moved to Caribou Creek.

Moving around to the west, we are recommending that the lower Sanford River be changed from Park to Preserve. This area has no significant non-hunting visitation and there are moose hunting opportunities. In addition, there are a series of lakes that are used for access into the Preserve country that presently exists to the north or south.

At the entrance of the Chitina valley, we are recommending that the entire Kotsina drainage be redesignated as Preserve. This is a major sheep hunting area which has supported a very high level of hunting use over the years. It is readily accessible to local hunters and also to those who come down from Fairbanks and Anchorage. Of course, this high level sport hunting activity existed until December 1978.

Farther east we are proposing, and disagreeing with S. 49, that the Kuskulana drainage which reaches down toward the village of Strelna remain in Park status. This will be the major place where the Park will come down from the Wrangell Mountains and follow a major river complex to the road that presently enables people to get to McCarthy. We think that it is appropriate that one major area along the road has an unhunted sheep population. Moreover, the Park Service has indicated that the location where the Kuskulana River crosses the road would be an excellent location for future visitor facility. In the future, the Wrangells will be one of the few parks in Alaska that people can reach by auto and that visitation will become very significant in this area.

Immediately to the south, we suggest altering S. 49 to leave the Tebay Lakes, Hanagita River, and Bremmer River systems in park status.

Congress specifically left the Tebay Lakes as non-wilderness to permit visitor development in that area. There are some private cabins in there now. Once a visitor reaches the Lakes (probably by float plane), he can go north into the Hangaita River country or south into the Bremner system. We are convinced that a recreational complex can be built around these three areas and believe that this potential non-hunting visitor use indicates that it should remain off-limits to sport hunting.

Moving up the Chitina valley, we are recommending that the entire Chakina-Klu River Tana River-Goat Creek country be opened to sport hunters. Not only does this area provide a quality trophy sheep hunt but there is virtually no conflict whatsoever with non-hunting uses. The area is rarely visited by non-hunters. We are proposing that this line go all the way up to the Baldwin Glacier and then cut across the juncture of the Chitna and Logan Glaciers to include this large and important area in Preserve.

Of course, the very upper end of the Chitina valley provides some of the finest trophy sheep hunting in North America. For a period of time, two of three world record rams came out of this country. We are making a departure from S. 49 in recommending that the Preserve not run right up to the border with Canada. On the Canadian side, there is the Kluane Park and the Canadians are interested in ensuring a "no hunting" zone for the Dall sheep. We share three ridges in common with Canada that are isolated by major glaciers. Our proposed boundary ensures that the common ridges remain in unhunted status on both U.S. and Canadian sides. Not only will this serve a primary park purpose--it provides a level of cooperation with our Canadian counterparts. Moreover, it establishes a discernible on-the-ground boundary because a person on the ground will know that once he reaches the juncture of the Chitna and Locan Glacier he can proceed no further to the east. If we find someone on these ridges, there can be no excuse that the individual did not know that he or she is in the Park.

Northwest of the upper Chitina is the Nizina-Chitistone country. We propose that sport hunting be permitted to resume in this area. It had been hunted for years and provided superb opportunities for Dall sheep. It also supported a number of guiding services. Although there is a fair amount of hiking through the area, conflicts are minimal. Hikers are in the valleys--sheep hunters are in the high country.

In summary, we recommend that a total of 3.1 million acres be redesignated as Preserve leaving over 5 million acres as Park--an area 225 percent larger than Yellowstone Park.

Additions to Katmai National Park and Preserve

We are proposing a major alteration to S.49 by recommending that all references to the Katmai unit be deleted from the bill. This suggestion is based on three factors.

First, Katmai Park (both old and new) is one of the few areas in Alaska where subsistence hunting is barred. At this moment, hunting by local residents as well as other citizens is prohibited within all portions of Katmai Park. We see no equity problems present that opening the area would cure.

Second, this area presently receives a relatively high level of visitation and we expect visitation of this area to increase. The existence of developed facilities is the primary reason for this level of use.

The third and primary factor relates to the population of brown bears that can be viewed at very close range. One of the world's greatest concentrations of bear are present within Katmai and in the adjacent McNeil River Bear Sanctuary managed by the State of Alaska. The McNeil Sanctuary abuts the Katmai Park. We believe that there is a real resource value in maintaining an unhunted population of bear that move back and forth between the McNeil area and the Brooks River area on Naknek Lake.

As a consequence of the present closure to all hunting, the visitation, and the value we see in maintaining an unhunted population of these bears, we are proposing that no changes be made. We are aware, however, that this area supported important sport hunting activities up until December 1978.

Additions to Denali National Park and Preserve

Denali is the old Mt. McKinley Park which was expanded by 3.7 million acres and renamed by the Alaska Lands Act in 1980. Our proposals deal solely with the 1980 additions.

Starting on the southside and working in a clockwise direction, we suggest that the S.49 designation of the Dunkle Mine area as Preserve be deleted. The Dunkle Mine area is presently under a specific Congresional study per section 202 (3)(b) of ANILCA and we would recommend that the study be completed before any alterations in the land status of that area are undertaken.

To the southwest, we urge that the Tokasitna Glacier country and the Kahiltna Glacier country be designated as Preserve. We propose that the Preserve-Park line start at the corner where the State's Denali State park line abuts the Federal Park boundary. This would establish a common starting point for land closed on the State side to hunting and land closed on the Federal side to hunting; the current lines overlap.

Our proposed boundary follows identified hydrographic and geologic features and opens the Lower Kahiltna and Lower Tokasitna areas that provide quality moose hunting. The moose move up out of the Susitna flats in the hunting season. This area is readily accessible to Anchorage, provides hunting opportunities for many Alaskan citizens and also for people from the Lower 48 who don't have the resources to reach the more remote spots. Moreover, you can drive up by using the Peters Creek road and then hiking up into this beautiful country. There is no significant non-hunter visitation in this area and the geologic and glacier features for which the area was included in the park will not be adversely affected in any manner, shape, or form by permitting the resumption of sport hunting.

We also propose that the area immediately west of the original Park--the head waters of the Swift Fork of the Kuskokwim--be designated Preserve. There seems to be general acknowledgement that Preserve designation here makes logical management sense. A number of guides worked this area prior to December 1978 and the area provided a measure of high quality sport hunting. Its remoteness and lack of any particular spectacular features have not made it a candidate for any type of visitor development nor has it attracted any non-sporting use.

To the north, we are proposing that the area west of Bear Creek be designated as Preserve. Preserve status would facilitate the trapping operations that had been conducted there for years, mostly by people from the Lake Minchumina area. However, east of Bear Creek we suggest that Park status be retained. This would include the Toklat River country.

The primary reasons for our suggestion are the prospects for conflict with visitors and the value in having a largely unhunted population of wildlife. As the committee is probably aware,the Park Service runs an extensively used bus tour that takes people to Wonder Lake. Moose, bear, caribou and sheep can regularly be seen from the road. Most of this wildlife move around in a north/south direction from the old park up into the Kantishna Hills/Toklat River area. We are recommending that the area to the north of the road remain in park status to protect those animals that are available to the viewing public.

We would also recommend that the line be kept west of the Wonder Lake/Kantishna area. There is a significant degree of visitor use that is expected to climb in the future. We think it would be appropriate to avoid creating future hunter/visitor conflicts by eliminating sport hunting in this area. In summary, we recommend that approximately 920,000 acres of the 1980 additions be designated Preserve. The remaining Park will encompass nearly 3.5 million acres.

Lake Clark National Park and Preserve

Our proposal designates more Preserve in this unit than S. 49, but in a different configuration. We suggest designating 1.38 million acres as Preserve leaving a Park unit of nearly 1.1 million acres--a park comparable to the Grand Canyon unit.

On the north side of the unit, we would place the Neacola and Chilligan River drainages into Preserve. This area drains east into the Susitna flats and is a historic hunting area. Service has been provided by different guides and because of its location on the east side of the Alaska Range, it is readily accessible by a short flight from Anchorage. Bear, moose, and sheep are the primary targets in this area. Of course, there are no significant visitors uses, nor any significant visitor facility proposed for this area. It is also presently open to hunting by local rural residents.

On the west, we propose that the Turquoise Lake area be redesignated Preserve because it is one of the number of lakes on the west side that had been historically used as access into the high country for the high quality multi-species hunting provided on the western side of the Alaska Range. The hunting opportunities in this area are excellent for not only the local Alaskan citizenry, but for the visitor from the Lower 48 without the means to reach more remote country in places like the Brooks Range.

We are proposing, however, that a vast 1.1 million acre Park remain centered on the Kontrashibuna/Upper Lake Clark/Twin Lake and Tlikakila River systems. This creates a core unit reaching from the Lake Clark Pass through a spectacular array of mountains and glaciers into the Tlikakila which feeds into upper Lake Clark. From the northwest, there is the Twin Lakes and upper Kijik River complex. Twin Lakes is a very beautiful area and was historically used as a jumpoff spot for hunting expeditions into the Upper Kijik and Twin Lake country. We think it should remain in park status because of probable visitor development on Twin Lakes. Moreover, it is an excellent jumping-off sport for float trips down the Chilikadrotna River and for hiking tours into the upper Kijik River which ties into Lake Clark. Park values in this area are significant and we believe it should be managed to avoid potential conflicts. Similarly, we propose that the Kontrashibuna Lake area above Port Alsworth also remain in Park status so that we have a vast park unit centered on the spectacular lakes and core river systems for non-hunting visitors.

In contrast, all the drainages flowing into upper Iliamna Lake, primarily the Pile River system, and the area draining into the

Chitnita Bay and Tuxedni Bay should be opened to sport hunting. This area provides excellent hunting for coastal bear and for moose. It is also readily accessible from Anchorage. We are proposing a discernible set of hydrographic boundaries. Because of limited visitor opportunities and because the dominant visitation in this area is and was by sportsmen who still use it for fishing and clamming activity, we think it is appropriate that sport hunting be permitted to resume.

Lastly, our proposed configuration conforms with the management sub-units identified in the Lake Clark General Management Plan. That plan divides the Park/Preserve into the Lake Country, Kijik, and Coastal Management Units. Our proposal would designate all of the Coastal Unit as Preserve, all of the Kijik unit as Park, and most of the Lake Country Unit (with the exception of Twin Lakes) as Preserve.

Kenai Fjords Park

We support S. 49, with respect to this unit. The area provides quality goat hunting and the proposed Preserve is quite distant from existing and future non-hunting visitation. Visitor use is focused on the Resurrection River area and the fjords in the eastern half of the unit.

Aniakchak Monument and Preserve

We are proposing an alteration to S. 49 in the direction of expanding the Preserve. Essentially, we are persuaded that a single Preserve unit makes the most management sense. Aniakchak is probably the most remote and difficult to reach unit of the national park system. Consequently, there will continue to be no conflicts with visitors. Moreover, this management approach is consistent with that already employed at Noatak, Bering Land Bridge, and Yukon Charley.

Of course, the entire area is now hunted by local residents. The addition of a handful of sport hunters will not have adverse affects on the wildlife value in the area. Frankly, we see no logical management reasons to try to delineate a park in this very remote, wild and generally unvisited area.

Additions to Glacier Bay Park and Preserve

The last area is the 1980 addition to Glacier Bay. We are focusing on the 1980 addition and not affecting in any manner, shape, or form the 2.7 million acre Glacier Bay unit that existed prior to enactment of the D-2 bill. We recommend that the entire addition, particularly the Alsek River and Deception Hills area, be designated as Preserve.

We recommend this because no significant visitation exists in the area. The overwhelming multitude of visitors who see Glacier Bay use Glacier Bay itself. There is also a fair measure of hiking, backpacking, and cross country skiing use, some of which originates on the outer coast essentially from Cape Fairweather south--an area which is within the old Park. The 1980 addition to the park is rarely used.

The historical use in the addition was in the Dry Bay, Deception Hills and Alsek River areas. Dry Bay was used for commercial fishing, whereas Deception Hills and the Alsek River were actively used sport hunting areas. Rather than try to draw a line to divide these areas, which cannot be done on a readily discernible basis, we decided to suggest that the entire addition be designated Preserve. This proposal protects and keeps the entire original 2.7 million park totally intact and off limits to all forms of hunting. But it reopens this coastal and river area so that traditional sport hunting for moose and bear can resume.

We strongly urge passage of a bill to expand sport hunting opportunities in Alaska. Although we are persuaded our proposals are balanced and sound, S. 49 as introduced is fully acceptable as a means of ensuring Congressional attention to this issue. America's millions of sportsmen deserve nothing less.

Proposed Amendments to S. 49

1. On pages 1 and 2, strike out lines 3 through 11 and lines 1 through 4 respectively.

2. On page 2, strike out line 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

> That section 201(4)(a) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2371; P.L. 96-487) is amended by

3. On page 2, strike out lines 10 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof:

> dated July 1980" and inserting in lieu thereof "two million seven hundred and fifty two thousand acres of public lands, Gates of the Arctic National Preserve, containing approximately five million two hundred thousand acres of public lands as generally depicted on a map numbered GAAR-90,011 and dated April 15, 1983, which shall be on file and

4. On page 2, strike out lines 17 through 24.

5. Renumber sections 4 through 9 as sections 2 through 7 respectively.

6. On page 3, strike out lines 7 through 12 and insert in lieu thereof:

> serting in lieu thereof "one million fifty nine thousand acres of public lands, and Lake Clark National Preserve containing approximately two million five hundred and ninety four thousand acres of public lands as generally depicted on a map numbered LACL-90,008 and dated April 15, 1983, which shall be on file and available for

7. On pages 3 and 4, strike out lines 20 through 24 and line 1 respectively and insert in lieu thereof:

> 1980" and insert in lieu thereof "five million forty seven thousand acres of public lands, and Wrangell-Saint Elias National Preserve, containing approximately seven million two hundred and seventy one thousand acres of public lands, as generally depicted on a map numbered WRST-90,007, and dated April 15, 1983, which shall be on file and availa-

8. On page 4, strike out lines 9 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof:

> dated July 1980" and inserting in lieu thereof "one million five hundred and six thousand acres of public land and approximately two million two hundred and fifty thousand acres of additional public land is hereby established as Denali National Preserve, both as generally depicted on a map numbered DENA-90,007 and dated April 15, 1983, which shall be on file and available for

9. On page 4, strike out lines 16 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof:

> SEC. 5. Section 201(5) of such Act is amended by striking "five hundred and sixty-seven thousand acres of public lands" and "October 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof respectively "four hundred and forty seven thousand acres of public lands, Kenai Fjords National Preserve, containing approximately 120,000 acres of public lands" and "April 15, 1983".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

10. On page 5, strike out lines 7 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof:

> ing in lieu thereof "five hundred and eighty thousand acres of Federal land which is hereby established as Glacier Bay National Preserve, both as generally depicted on a map numbered GLBA-90,004, and dated April 15, 1983, which

11. On page 5, strike out lines 14 through 25 and insert in lieu thereof:

> SEC. 7. Section 201(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "Aniakchak National Monument, containing approximately one hundred and thirty eight thousand acres of public lands, and". Section 201(1) of such Act is further amended by striking out "three hundred and seventy six thousand acres" and "October 1978" and inserting in lieu thereof respectively "five hundred and fourteen thousand acres" and "April 15, 1983".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Administration Proposed Amendments to S. 49

Unit	Approximate Acreage in New Preserve
Gates of the Artic Park & Preserve	4,300,000
Wrangell-St. Elias Park & Preserve	3,100,000
Additions to Denali Park & Preserve	920,000
Lake Clark Park & Preserve	1,380,000
Kenai Fjords Park	120,000
Aniakchak Monument & Preserve	138,000
Additions to Glacier Bay Park & Preserve	523,000
Katmai Park & Preserve	- 0 -
	10,481,000

PARK/PRESERVE UNIT	VISITATION*	DOMINANT USES
Denali	R-321,868 N-240,545	Wildlife Bus Tour Anchorage-Fairbank Highway
Lake Clark	R-10,440 N-4,240	Sport fishing River floating Subsistence
Gates of the Arctic	R-1,522 N-2,546	Hiking/Floating Alatna System Subsistence
Kenai Fjords	R-16,118 N-480	Resurrection River visits
Wrangell-St. Elias	R-14,871 N-399	McCarthy Road use Sport hunting
Katmai	R-14,377 N-106	Brooks Camp Sport fishing
Glacier Bay	R-90,354 N-1,172	Glacier Bay tours
Aniakchak	None	

*R-Recreation
N-Nonrecreation (e.g., subsistence, residents)

MAY 10 1983

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

Official Committee File

MAY 9 1983

SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
RECEIVED
MAY 10 1983
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

Honorable James A. McClure
Chairman, Committee on Energy and
Natural Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is in response to your request of March 2, 1983, for the views of the Office of Management and Budget on S. 49, a bill "To redesignate public land in Alaska to allow hunting."

The Office of Management and Budget concurs in the views of the Department of the Interior as expressed by Deputy Under Secretary William Horn and Assistant Secretary G. Ray Arnett in their testimony before the Committee on this legislation on April 15, 1983. Accordingly, we support enactment of S. 49 with certain amendments as proposed by the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely,

James M. Frey

James M. Frey
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR HATFIELD

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANICLA) established areas within Alaska where subsistence hunting could occur. This compromise was reached after many hours of debate and deliberation. S. 49 expands the narrow confines of subsistence hunting by allowing sport hunters the same opportunities within certain boundaries and under conditions specified by Alaskan game authorities.

When S. 49 was introduced I was hesitant to support it because of the precedent setting nature this bill represents. Although the bill, in my opinion, is clear in establishing that park preserve status is clearly an Alaskan situation, I felt that national parks in the lower 48 states could be affected at some future date. I do not believe such a situation should be allowed to happen.

I fully supported the amendment offered by Senator Warner and unanimously adopted by the committee. It clearly put the committee on record in establishing that it is not appropriate to consider similar types of changes in the lower 48 states.

Furthermore, due to the support this bill has received from the Alaskan Congressional delegation, Alaska's Governor, and many Alaskan citizens, I voted to report this bill from the committee. However I will reserve my judgement on this bill until it is considered by the Senate, and feel it deserves the spirited debate that it is sure to receive.

MARK O. HATFIELD.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR WARNER

I voted to report S. 49 without recommendation because it is supported by Alaska's Governor, Alaska's entire Congressional delegation, and a very significant portion of Alaska's citizens. Because they are so strongly united on this issue, it is my judgment that they should be given the opportunity of debating the merits of the bill before the full Senate. I am, however, reserving final judgment on this legislation until full Senate consideration.

As some protection against establishing a precedent for similar action in other National parks, I offered an amendment to S. 49, which was unanimously adopted by the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. My amendment placed the Committee members on record as reaffirming the policies of Congress that the designation of park preserves in S. 49 is a unique situation applicable only to specific national parks in Alaska and does not have applicability to other national parks in the United States, nor is it appropriate to consider similar measures regarding national parks outside of Alaska.

S. 49 represents a response to an unparalleled situation, namely, the role of sport hunting in Alaska as a result of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA). Under ANILCA, only "subsistence" hunters were provided access to many bountiful areas within the confines of national parks. In redesignating selected areas from national park to park preserve status, S. 49 allows licensed sport hunters this same opportunity, subject to conditions set by game management authorities. S. 49 continues the bans placed on logging, mining, drilling, and all other types of development and, in addition, S. 49 has been amended to cover less than one-half of the original acreage proposed for hunting when the bill was introduced.

I will oppose any attempts to alter S. 49 in such a way that would encompass more than limited hunting on Alaska lands issue.

JOHN W. WARNER.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MURKOWSKI

On August 4, 1983, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee voted on S. 49, the Alaska Hunting Bill. During the markup of S. 49 there was extensive debate regarding the redesignation of specific public lands in Alaska from national park status to park preserve status. The only distinction between a national park and a park preserve is that sport hunting and trapping is allowed in a park preserve.

Congress used the Park Preserve designation in ANILCA to deal with Alaska's special hunting needs while remaining within the National Park concept in every other respect. Park Preserves in Alaska are managed by the National Park Service and are subject to all the use of restrictions applicable to other National Park lands except the hunting ban. No mineral exploration and extraction, timber harvesting, or other commercial resource development is permitted within them. Senator Stevens and I have pledged to prevent amendments to S. 49 during the present Congress that would lift these restrictaions.

During the markup of S. 49, there were many allegations made by its opponents that this bill would reopen the Alaska Lands debate, that S. 49 was for the benefit of a few rich sport hunters and that S. 49 would open other national parks outside Alaska to sport hunting. I am taking this opportunity to respond to these allegations and to correct other inaccuracies.

S. 49 was introduced by Senator Stevens, myself, and 20 Senate co-sponsors to amend a specific section of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and not to "open up" the Alaska Lands debate. In December of 1978, President Carter unilaterially closed 44 million acres in Alaska to sport hunting. This action totally prohibited sport hunting in all of the following traditional hunting areas: Wrangell-St. Elias Mountains, the Gates of the Arctic, north, south and west of the original Mt. McKinley Park, north of the Katmai Monument, Lake Alsek and the Alsek River country.

Prior to the Carter 1978 withdrawals, all of these lands had been open to subsistence and non-subsistence hunters for generations without damage to wildlife populations. Alaska is well known for its tremendous population of wildlife, with a population of caribou of over 400,000, a Brown Bear population in the area of 7,000 to 10,000, and Dall Sheep numbering in excess of 50,000.

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980 replaced the Carter withdrawals with a system of National Parks, most of which are open to subsistence hunters, and National Park Preserves, which were open to all hunters. A substantial majority of the Senate voted at one point during the 1980 floor debate on Alaska lands to restore hunting in more areas than ANILCA did. When ANILCA came to the Senate floor as a substitute for this Committee's proposal during the 1980 Senate debate on Alaska lands, however, procedural constraints precluded amending it to match the majority's decision. Thus, ANILCA only partially remedied the injustice created by the Carter withdrawals.

Under ANILCA, more than 22 million acres of new National Park lands in Alaska are open to subsistence hunters and closed to sport hunting. More than 2 million acres of additional park lands were closed to all hunters.

One of the results of ANILCA was the establishment of two distinct classes of hunters in Alaska. Under ANILCA only rural subsistence users could hunt in 22 million acres of new National Parks, even though up until the 1978 withdrawals, these areas were open to hunting by all Alaskans.

This distinction between a subsistence hunter and a non-subsistence hunter may not seem important to my colleagues, but let me assure them that this distinction has been one of intense emotional debate in Alaska. Subsistence hunters in Alaska are not only allowed to hunt on all areas open to urban hunters, but they are allowed to hunt on the additional 22 million acres of National Parks. S. 49 would be a first step in rectifying this inequity by designating 12 million of those 22 million acres as park preserves, which would allow hunting by all Alaskans.

A concern raised during the markup of S. 49 regarded protection of subsistence hunters priority, from non-resident and non-subsistence hunters. First, 91 percent of all hunting licenses in Alaska are sold to Alaska residents who hunt for game and water fowl for their own personal use. Secondly, under Title VIII of ANILCA and under Alaska State law, absolute legal protection is given to subsistence use priority. Subsistence protection exists for all lands in the State of Alaska, regardless of whether it occurs in a national park or not. The subsistence provision applies to the 325 million acres of Alaska lands outside the national park system and becomes operative when Alaska Department of Fish and Game determines there is a shortage of wildlife.

Strictly-regulated hunting is an element of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game's comprehensive wildlife conservation program which is widely recognized as one of the finest in North America. Under Alaska law, the Department is obligated to conserve wildlife and provide for its use in accordance with the sustained-yield principle. In addition, S. 49 is supported by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, an organization composed of wildlife conservation professionals from all 50 states. The association endorses hunting as an effective wildlife conservation tool.

Under S. 49, the full expertise of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would be used to manage the wildlife resources. Contrasting the expertise and resources of the State of Alaska with those of the Federal Government demonstrates the advantages of state management of the proposed redesignated areas.

In 1982, the State Division of Game employed 93 full-time game biologists and budgeted more than $19 million to carry out the Department's biological and management responsibilities. The Alaska Division of Public Safety employed more than 100 people for wildlife enforcement activities and budgeted more than $13 million for that responsibility.

In contrast, the National Park Service employs only one full-time biologist in Alaska; the Park Service has five other employees whose primary responsibility is for wildlife biology habitat or research in Alaska. The National Park Service's budget for this work in Alaska is only $46,900. These figures clearly indicate the importance the State of Alaska places on wise game management as opposed to the Federal Government, which has over 50 percent of all national parks located in Alaska, but only allocates 1 percent of their employees to managing Alaska's natural resources.

The opponents of S. 49 have purposely distorted the bill's intent and its effect. S. 49 would not remove any land from the National Park System or affect National Parks in the lower 48 or National Parks in Alaska established by ANILCA. The opponents of the bill disregard this and argue that S. 49 sets a dangerous precedent for the National Park System units outside Alaska. They ignore the fact that hunting is currently permitted on almost 4 million acres of Park System lands in the lower 48 states, including one of the crown jewels of the old Park System, Grand Teton National Park. S. 49 sets no precedent; Congress has already determined that in certain cases hunting is compatible with purposes of the National Park System in the lower 48 states.

Charges that expansion of the National Park Preserves would seriously interfere with non-hunting recreational uses of Alaska's National Parks are untrue and unfounded.

First, most of the areas included in the bill are many miles away from present and planned recreational sites within the National Parks and these areas are seldom visited by backpackers or used for other forms of recreation. In fact, some of the areas are so inaccessible or of such minimal scenic value that the ban on hunting serves only to exclude the one group of recreational users who want to visit these areas: hunters.

Second, most hunting in Alaska takes place in the late fall after non-hunting recreational use of the National Parks has peaked.

The opponents of S. 49 have also argued that since the National Park lands in Alaska occupy only around 9 percent of the State's surface area, expansion of the National Park Preserves to create more hunting opportunities is unnecessary. A statement that was repeatedly made during the markup of S. 49 was that over 90 percent of Alaska is presently open for sport hunting when actually the figure is closer to 60 percent. This statement assumes that all acreage in Alaska supports wildlife habitat and offers viable hunting opportunities. This statement is misleading and deliberately disregards the fact that approximately one third of Alaska does not support viable populations of wildlife or is closed to sport hunting or is subject to closures or other restrictions. For example, glaciers cover over 28,800 square miles, or 5 percent of Alaska. There are over 15 million acres of rivers and lakes. The following is a partial listing of some of the acreage in Alaska that is closed or has the potential of being closed to sport hunting.

Closed by Federal or State statute or regulations:	*Millions of Acres*
National parks and monuments (closed to hunting)	31.4
Prudhoe Bay (closed to hunting)	2.3

Trans-Alaska Pipeline Road (closed to discharging of firearms)	0.3
Denali State Park (closed to discharging of firearms)	0.3
Municipalities of Anchorage and Fairbanks	0.4
Private lands (potential closure)	45.0
Acreage that does not support huntable habitat:	
Yukon Delta Wildlife Refuge	6.0
Aleutian Islands	1.3
Lakes and rivers	15.0
Glaciers (not in national parks)	6.0
Total	[1] 108.0

[1] Note that this figure does not include municipalities such as Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka, Wrangell and other smaller cities.

In all, about one third of the State is closed or is subject to closure. Perhaps even more importantly, a significant portion of the big game habitat in Alaska currently open to hunting is of low quality or is inaccessible.

Despite the arguments of S. 49's opponents, the fact remains that under ANILCA, a substantial part of the prime, accessible hunting land in Alaska is closed to non-subsistence hunters, the vast majority of whom are Alaska residents.

S. 49 as reported from Committee was drastically altered from its original form of introduction.

This Committee voted to delete 4 of the 8 National Park Preserve redesignations proposed in S. 49. The 4 redesignations that remain are of crucial importance to Alaskans because of the majority of Alaskan residents' access to large populations of wildlife herds.

S. 49 would redesignate 2.3 million acres of the 8.1 million acre Wrangell-St. Elias National Park as Park Preserve. Some of the finest Dall sheep hunting lands in Alaska, such as the White River area and the Copper-Tanada Lakes District, would be included in the redesignation. The redesignated area would also contain significant populations of goat, moose, grizzly bear, and caribou. Although the Wrangell-St. Elias region is known world-wide for its fine sport hunting, before the 1978 withdrawals only 12 percent of the Dall sheep hunters on land included in S. 49 were non-residents.

Approximately 1 million acres of the 2.4 million acres in Lake Clark National Park would be redesignated as Park Preserves. This redesignation would include substantial populations of moose, caribou, Dall sheep, and grizzly bear.

One and a half million acres of the 4.4 million acre Denali National Park would be redesignated as Park Preserve. The redesignation would include important moose, bear, and sheep lands. None of the old Mount McKinley National Park would be redesignated.

It is important to note that these three redesignations include lands that are accessible to the residents of Fairbanks, other Interior communities, and Anchorage and were hunted by Alaskans for years before the Carter withdrawals. Subsistence hunting is currently permitted in all of these areas.

Finally, S. 49 as reported by the Committee redesignates most of the 138,000 acres of Aniakchak National Monument as Park Preserve. The redesignated area would include populations of bear and caribou.

Senator Warner successfully offered an amendment, which I supported, that recognized Alaska's unique situation and specified that it was not the intent of S. 49 to open National Parks in the lower 48 states to hunting.

While I reluctantly agreed with some of the changes made by the Committee, I am greatly disappointed that it chose to delete the proposed 6 million acre addition to the Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve in the central Brooks Range. The addition would have included important sheep, moose, caribou and bear hunting lands that have a long history of use by non-subsistence Alaskan hunters from Fairbanks and other Interior Alaska communities. These lands are currently open to subsistence hunters.

During the markup of S. 49, a concern was expressed that the expansion of the Gates of the Arctic National Preserve was incompatible with the needs of subsistence hunters in the area. S. 49, however, does not affect the subsistence preference established in ANILCA and Alaska statutes. Moreover, concern over the needs of the subsistence hunters in certain portions of Gates of the Arctic does not justify the deletion of the entire proposed addition to the Preserve.

The Gates of the Arctic was open to all Alaskan hunters prior to the Carter withdrawal of December 1978. This has been a traditional hunting area for all Alaskans. Additionally, this area is remote and there are no conflicts between hunting and non-hunting uses which would attract a significant number of non-hunter tourists. The Gates of the Arctic National Park covers over 5 million acres and would be far better managed in a uniform manner by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game which would provide sound management and ecological consistency.

The Committee's deletion of the proposed expansion of the Katmai National Preserve also disappoints me. The land included in the expansion is currently closed to all hunters. S. 49 would reopen brown bear, moose, and caribou hunting lands that were important to both subsistence and non-subsistence hunters before the 1978 closures. I hope that the additions to the Gates of the Arctic and Katmai National Preserves will be restored later in the legislative process.

S. 49 is a conservation measure responding in a balanced fashion to the legitimate concerns of hunters. It would facilitate the conservation of Alaska's wildlife and correct a serious inequity between rural and urban hunters without jeopardizing the wildlife, scenic, and non-hunting recreational values of Alaska's National Park complexes.

Even after the passage of S. 49, more than twenty million acres of National Park lands in Alaska, an area nearly equal to the total National Park System acreage in the other 49 States would remain closed to non-subsistence hunting. These lands would include most areas of high non-hunting recreational interest as well as substantial populations of caribou, moose, Dall sheep, goats, and brown/grizzly bears.

The arguments of the opponents of S. 49 are based more on emotion than on fact. One can only conclude that the real reason they object to S. 49 is simply that they want to restrict hunting opportunities in Alaska. They are opposed to hunting even when it does not impinge on the protection of wildlife and scenic values or on the rights of non-hunter recreation users. I refuse to believe that such intolerance should be permitted to dictate Federal land management policy in Alaska.

In closing, let me say that members of Congress have not had to live with the results of ANILCA, but Alaskans have had to do so. The adoption of S. 49 as reported from the Committee and with the inclusion of the Gates of the Arctic, will not correct all the problems of ANILCA, but it will be the first step in rectifying the problem caused by ANILCA.

FRANK H. MURKOWSKI.

MINORITY VIEWS

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR JACKSON

I voted against reporting S. 49 not because I am opposed to hunting. My record on sportsmen's issues is a good one, and I certainly make no apologies for it. However, the fundamental policy issue raised by this measure is not "Are you for hunting or against hunting?" Rather, the issue is whether the Congress wants to change a land allocation decision made in 1980 after long and careful consideration of competing interests and values. In one sense, it is analogous to any wilderness or park bill where the Congress is asked to make a land-use decision. Competing values must be considered, balanced, and in most instances, a compromise reached. Such a compromise does not necessarily imply that one is opposed to wilderness areas, parks, development, or hunting. S. 49 is no different. To suggest otherwise does a disservice to its proponents and is grossly unfair to its opponents.

From 1976 to 1980, this Committee held numerous hearings, workshops, and public meetings on the Alaska lands issue. I had the privilege of chairing all 58 Committee business meetings on this issue. I floor managed the bill in the Senate for 9 days, and I was one of the Senators involved in formulating the final compromise that passed the Senate overwhelmingly and ultimately was adopted by the House. The bill we crafted was not perfect. No group got everything it wanted. But I happen to believe that the balance we struck was fair and reasonable to all parties; and that includes those who wanted more lands closed to sport hunting and those who wanted more lands open for that purpose.

The bill was not "pro-development," "anti-mining," "pro-conservationist," or "anti-timber." ANILCA is not "pro" or "anti" anything, and hunting is no exception. We addressed the concerns of sport hunters by creating some 19 million acres of National Preserves. These are lands managed by the National Park Service just like National Parks except sport hunting is permitted. We addressed the concerns of sport hunters by adjusting park boundaries in a number of instances to accommodate sport hunting. We addressed the concerns of sport hunters by adopting a number of special management provisions specifically to facilitate sport hunting. And, we addressed the concerns of sport hunters by opening some 15 million acres to sport hunting that were closed in 1978 as a result of President Carter's actions under the Antiquities Act.

The Congress did not make these land-use allocations and designations hastily. Nor did it make them in a vacuum. Through countless hours of negotiation and compromise, a consensus was reached not only on hunting but on the myriad of other issues involved as well.

I am pleased that the amendment reported by the Committee reduced the adverse impact of the introduced bill. But I remain convinced that it is too soon to make major changes in the consensus reached in 1980 for the benefit of any single interest.

As this Report indicates, the Committee voted to report S. 49 "without recommendation." Some of those who voted to report the bill in this equivocal manner indicate that their vote is not an indication of support for S. 49. This sophistry should not go unchallenged. Any vote in favor of reporting S. 49 is a vote for the bill and against the Senate's Committee system. This system is intended to keep bills that are not favored by a majority of the Committee members from reaching the Senate Calendar. That system has been compromised by the Committee's action.

HENRY M. JACKSON.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR BUMPERS

I voted against reporting S. 49, the Alaska National Hunting Act, for two reasons. I cannot support any legislation which alters the delicate land allocation compromise embodied in the 1980 Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act (ANILCA), nor can I support legislation which, without compelling reason, changes the status of lands within the National Park System.

Proponents of S. 49 have argued that those who oppose the bill are anti-hunting, and that the interests of hunters were ignored during the development of ANILCA. In fact, the Congress created 19 million acres of National Park Preserves in Alaska—nearly as much land as was included in new National Parks—specifically to provide exceptional hunting opportunities for sportsmen. Altogether, more than 90 percent of the State of Alaska was left open to sport hunting.

Clearly, hunting interests were as respected as the interests of the oil and gas industry, the minerals industry, the timber industry, Alaska natives, park and wilderness advocates, and other sports enthusiasts. By altering the land allocation made by ANILCA, S. 49 would unfairly benefit one interest at the expense of others, and would encourage other groups to seek amendments to ANILCA beneficial to them.

The Alaska Lands Act represents the most comprehensive land use compromise ever approved by the Congress. Every member of the Senate who was involved in that compromise realized that its implementation would be a difficult and lengthy process. Three years after enactment of ANILCA, management plans for all of the new National Parks have not yet been completed. I would oppose significant changes to ANILCA proposed by any industry or interest group until after the land allocation is fully implemented and reviewed by the Congress.

I am also convinced that passage of S. 49 would establish an undesirable precedent for the National Park System. The 1916 National Park Organic Act clearly states that the purpose of the National Park System is:

> to conserve the scenery and the natural historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner as by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

Sport hunting is not allowed in National Parks either in Alaska or in the lower 48 States, and acreage within a National Park has never been re-designated to allow hunting. No reason exists which justifies the unprecedented change in the status of National Park lands which S. 49 would effect.

Finally, I strongly object to the Committee's decision to report S. 49 to the Senate without recommendation. The Committee has neglected its responsibility to advise the Senate on matters within its jurisdiction by failing to take a position on this proposal. The Senate should note that the Committee first voted to reduce by nearly one-half the acreage that S. 49 would affect before voting to report the bill. Even as amended, the bill is not supported by a majority of Committee members.

DALE BUMPERS.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATORS TSONGAS AND CHAFEE

S. 49, as introduced, would have downgraded 12 million acres in eight national parks in Alaska to national preserves in order to allow sport and trophy hunting. After three days of debate, S. 49 was amended, eliminating four parks and seven million acres from the bill. S. 49 was reported without recommendation by a vote of 11 to 8.

While we were pleased by the Committee's decision to greatly reduce the acreage to be downgraded from park to preserve and the decision to report the bill without the Committee's endorsement, the intensity of our opposition to the bill has not been lessened.

Passage of S. 49 would undermine the integrity of the national park system, eliminate many of the wildlife sanctuaries in North America, set a dangerous precedent for parks in the rest of the world, and would reopen the multiplicity of issues resolved in the compromise represented by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

PROTECTING THE NATIONAL PARK CONCEPT

The purpose of National Parks in the United States is to preserve the nation's finest scenic, archaeological, and natural wonders in perpetuity for present and future generations to enjoy. The preservation of these marvelous areas is accomplished through maintaining the specific ecological balance which is already found in each park. National parks allow visitors a close up view less wary populations of wildlife while simultaneously preserving strong gene pools and providing benchmark data on wildlife for scientific studies. As stated in the 1916 National Parks Organic Act, the purpose of the National Park system is:

> to conserve the scenery and the natural historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

This Park concept was reaffirmed in 1970 by the Public Land Law Review Commission in their report to Congress where they specifically stated that trophy hunting was an activity that was found to be "inconsistent with park purposes and objectives." Thus, wildlife, fish and plants are protected and preserved in the National Parks.

This history of the prohibition on hunting in national parks demonstrates that hunters not only supported this closure but also began the movement nearly one hundred years ago which led to this long-established policy. When Yellowstone National Park (the first national park) was established in 1872, hunting was permitted. The Boone and Crockett Club, a prestigious sportsmen's organization, (one of whose founders was Theodore Roosevelt) began the fight to close the national part to hunting when it became apparent that the wildlife, lacking protection from hunting, was being decimated by hunters and trappers. They succeeded, and in 1984, an "Act to Protect the Birds and Animals in Yellowstone National Park" was passed, establishing the precedent for prohibiting hunting in national parks. Since then upon congressional designation of a national park, whether in the lower 48 or in Alaska or Hawaii, the lands within the parks' boundaries have been closed to hunting.

The purpose of our national parks has been reaffirmed many times by Congress and never overturned or even seriously questioned. S. 49 as reported directly threatens the integrity of the national park system by arguing that 5 million acres of national park should be redesignated national preserve in order to open the area to sport hunting.

The national parks in Alaska were designated by Congress in 1980 after four years of intense scrutiny and debate. These parks are in the midst of their congressionally mandated planning process; most are still collecting data so as to determine how best to manage the lands. That process should be completed before any refinements to ANILCA regarding parks should be made.

In Alaska, the nation has perhaps its best—and last—opportunity to preserve entire ecosystems in their natural state of the benefit of present and future generations. Alaska park lands—unmatched anywhere in the world—were set aside by ANILCA to be preserved as natural wildlife sanctuaries where all Americans can enjoy the beauty of untamed nature of which wildlife is an integral part. The Alaskan national parks are, by no means, second-class citizens in the National Park System. In fact, they contain the crown jewels of the system and are a heritage for the future which should not be mortgaged to any purpose.

One of the main purposes of our National Park System is to ensure that there are areas in the nation where wildlife can live without human interference. All of the national parks throughout the United States, including the ones in Alaska, are closed to sport hunting. In ANILCA, Congress very deliberately set aside areas of wildlife habitat, as national parks, to be protected for several reasons:

First, the American people want some areas of their nation where they can have the unique experience of viewing wildlife that is less frightened of humans and more easily observed than animals in areas open to sport hunting. Having very little exposure to hunting, Alaska's park animals will have no reason to be afraid and will be, therefore, more easy to view and photograph. Hunted populations on the other hand, are more wary of humans and flee much more readily when people are near. One of the unique aspects of Alaska's National Parks is this ability to view large species of wildlife such as bear, moose, and sheep. This opportunity will be seriously impaired and in many cases lost if the parks are downgraded to preserve status;

Second, national parks provide protection for wildlife gene pools. The biogenetic characteristics of wild animals are preserved for potential restocking and research;

Third, by maintaining wildlife and their habitat in as natural a condition as possible, scientific studies and research can provide a benchmark against which to measure data and management on other lands open to hunting. This benchmark is increasingly rare in all fields of scientific study especially those involving large animals. These studies are used not only to enhance the survival of big game species but also to provide information which may be essential to man's survival (disease, adaptation, etc.);

Fourth, these national park wildlife sanctuaries preserve habitat areas sufficiently large to enable animal populations to be self-regulating and self-sustaining in perpetuity without any need for human interference in the form of habitat manipulation or species manipulation through sport hunting. In Alaska, unlike the case in most areas of the lower 48 states, natural predator-prey relationships still exist. Thus, the population of animals is kept in balance with their available food supplies. In this manner, national parks provide ecosystem integrity, offering a great opportunity to preserve entire ecosystems in an essentially natural state.

Finally, wildlife in Alaska needs protection. Contrary to popular belief, wildlife populations in Alaska, on a per-acre basis, are relatively low compared to the lower 48 states. This is due in part to the extremely harsh climate in Alaska which is not conducive to high reproductive levels and to increasing energy, mineral and other development which gradually affect areas of wildlife habitat. Unless given refuge in protected national parks, the magnificent animals of Alaska are no more immune to extinction than were the buffalo and antelope of the American West at the turn of the century.

Besides the impacts that S. 49 would have on park ecosystems there would be serious international ramifications to the United States downgrading national park lands for any reason whatsoever. The national park concept is a uniquely American contribution to civilization. The American National Park System is one of the most highly regarded park systems in the world. Other nations have followed our lead and established their own national parks. They look to us to uphold the national park concept. A recent letter from the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada voices these sentiments:

> Canadians have always looked to the American park system for guidance on issues related to park management. Passage of the Alaska Hunting Bill will seriously diminish the integrity of the American System. In the eyes of the international conservation community it will demonstrate that the American system can be easily dismantled. Furthermore, it will set a dangerous precedent in opening up park lands to commercial hunting.

This excerpt clearly points out that many park professionals in other countries are concerned that if Congress jeopardize the purposes of the national park concept in the U.S. it will certainly undermine other wildlife and conservation efforts throughout the world.

S. 49 undermines the purpose of the National Park System, would lead to drastically decreased wildlife habitat in national parks and sets a dangerous and irresponsible example for the rest of the world. For these reasons, among many others, S. 49 as reported should be defeated. Our National Park System is something the American people hold in high regard and protecting its integrity should be a high national priority.

SUBSISTENCE HUNTING IN ALASKA

Subsistence

Proponents of S. 49 say that it is a "sport hunters equity" bill. They argue that the Alaska Lands Act closed off areas which had previously been open to hunting. At the same time, the Act permitted subsistence hunting in these areas by members of certain rural Alaskan communities. Thus, they conclude that ANILCA discriminates against urban Alaskans and creates two classes of citizens in Alaska based on residency. They argue on this basis of equity for opening the Yellowstones and Yosemites of Alaska to sport hunting.

This reasoning is faulty because it ignores Congress intent in providing a special designation for subsistence hunters, and because it seriously overstates the extent of subsistence hunting which actually takes place in Alaska's national parks.

An understanding of the Congress special treatment of subsistence hunters begins with Congress definition of "subsistence *use.*" According to Section 803 of ANILCA, the term "subsistence uses" means "the *customary and traditional* uses by *rural* Alaska residents of wild renewable resources for *direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools or transportation.*" (Emphasis added.)

This definition makes clear Congress intention that qualification as a subsistence user of the national parks be based on need rather than on place of residency. Thus, not every rural Alaskan resident is to be considered a subsistence user but only those people who have customarily and traditionally been subsistence hunters and who continue to have no alternative but subsistence hunting to provide food, clothing and shelter for themselves.

This definition of subsistence use and users is found throughout ANILCA's legislative history. The 1980 Senate Energy Committee reports explain the special treatment of subsistence users:

> Alaska's more than 200 rural villages are unique in that they are the last communities in the United States in which a substantial number of residents are still dependent upon the harvest of renewable resources on the public lands for their sustenance. (Senate Report No. 96-413, pg. 230.)
>
> In addition to the cultural importance of the subsistence life style, the Committee is also aware that curtailment of subsistence uses would impose major hardships upon many residents of rural Alaska. It is a combination of these fac-

> tors which has led the Committee to conclude that there is a need to continue the opportunity for subsistence uses of renewable resources, including wildlife, within *certain* National Parks and Monuments by *local rural residents who have,* or are member of a family which has, an established or historical pattern of subsistence uses within such units. (Emphasis added. Senate Report No. 96-413, pg. 169.)

In addition to providing for subsistence needs, Congress wanted to provide for the continuation of a genuine subsistence way of life that is unique to Alaska and is vital to the cultural, spiritual and social well-being of rural Alaska residents. Thus, Congress intended that the Alaska Lands Act protect not only the natural and wildlife values of Alaska but also its cultural and historic values.

Proponents of S. 49 are not only disregarding the reasons for and extent of Congressional support for traditional subsistence uses but also, they err in contending that S. 49 is needed to remedy alleged inequities. On the contrary, S. 49 would create inequities for subsistence hunters who would be forced to compete with sport hunters for the limited wildlife. Preventing just such a conflict between subsistence users and sport hunters was an important issue considered by Congress during the Alaska lands debate and resolved through ANILCA.

During Senate floor debate of the subsistence issue in July of 1980 (Congressional Record, July 23, 1980, S9633-9636) it was pointed out repeatedly that preserve designations would "create a clear conflict" between subsistence hunters and sport hunters as sport hunters are allowed to move into areas exclusively used by subsistence hunters. S. 49 would put the subsistence users in many areas in direct competition with sport hunters and guided trophy hunters.

The danger of having the needs of subsistence users sacrificed for other interests is of great concern to many of the native organizations which would be affected by S. 49. In response to the introduction of S. 49, the Tanana Chiefs Conference, Inc. (a non-profit native association representing the largest land area in central Alaska) passed a resolution (#83-75, March 17, 1983) opposing the bill and discussed the issue in a subsequent editorial, which begins:

> A proposal to allow sport hunting on millions of acres of National Park land in Alaska would reverse the gains made through ANILCA in 1980 and do nothing to remove the wedge that has been driven between subsistence and sport hunters . . .
>
> Subsistence users in many parts of the TCC (Tanana Chiefs Conference) area would be affected by the proposal. Those on the upper Koyukuk near the Gates of the Arctic National Park would compete for moose and caribou with trophy hunters from Alaska's urban areas. People in Nikolai would see a similar situation in new parts of Denali National Park.
>
> ANILCA was a major step toward protecting the rural lifestype in the face of increasing pressure from sport hunters . . . Stevens' proposal . . . would damage the intent and substance of ANILCA. His motives are clearly

> political . . . Stevens said he wants to ease the "dichotomy between subsistence hunters and non-subsistence hunters." . . . But the final effect on many TCC area residents would be in the destruction of a law that safeguards their ability to survive in the bush.

Other native groups from the Gates of the Arctic National Park area have also adopted resolutions against S. 49. Eugene Brown, Major of the North Slope Borough, in a letter to a member of the Committee voiced native concerns with increasing hunting in the Gates, noting that "there have been restrictions imposed upon our taking of caribou" due to "alleged depletion of game" and therefore "we are extremely reluctant to encourage any reclassification of any lands within the North Slope Borough which will result in increased hunting pressure * * *"

The Anaktuvuk Pass City Council also passed a resolution opposing "the Amendments to ANILCA now in the U.S. Congress, which would reopen Gates of the Arctic National Park to Sports Hunting and Trapping by Non-Local Residents because any Amendments to ANILCA which would re-open sports hunting and trapping to non-local residents in large parts of Gates of the Arctic National Park would interfere with the local needs in subsistence hunting and trapping." Fortunately the Senate Energy Committee agreed with arguments against leaving the Gates of the Arctic in S. 49 and therefore voted to delete this magnificent park from the bill. Similar arguments are applicable to the rest of the bill as reported.

Besides ignoring Congress mandate to protect traditional subsistence uses, the proponents of S. 49 have exposed the weakness of their "equity for sport hunters" arguments by greatly overstating the amount of parkland which is available to subsistence hunters. If "equity" for sport hunters means that areas currently open to subsistence hunting will be open to sport hunting as well, then most of the 12 million acres affected by S. 49 as introduced should be dropped from the bill. In fact, the vast majority of the new parklands in S. 49 are presently closed to subsistence hunting under ANILCA. In the national parks in Alaska Congress permitted subsistence hunting only where it traditionally occurred and only for the species traditionally utilized. The "equity" argument would not support S. 49 as introduced and will not support the bill as reported.

The following analysis of the real extent and intensity of subsistence hunting in the parks S. 49 as originally introduced would change to preserves reveals that, to a large extent or completely, these areas are not now hunted and qualify as wildlife sanctuaries:

—Three of the new units are close to subsistence hunting because these areas have no history of subsistence use: Katmai addition (1 million acres); Glacier Bay addition (523,000 acres); and Kenai Fjords (567,000 acres).

—Rarely if ever do subsistence hunters venture into Aniakchiak (138,000 acres), whose boundaries were drawn to exclude areas used by both subsistence and sport hunters.

—In Denali addition (2.4 million acres), Lake Clark (2.4 million acres), and Wrangell-St. Elias (8.1 million acres), subsistence hunting is confined principally to the outer edges because of the parks' distance from subsistence communities and the exceptionally mountainous terrain in the core park areas. With two minor exceptions, the use of airplanes is not permitted for subsistence hunting.

—Even in Gates of the Arctic (7 million acres), which is unique in having a subsistence village within its boundaries, subsistence hunting is concentrated primarily in river valleys near the village of Anaktuvuk Pass. Some additional subsistence hunting occurs in peripheral river valleys by other villages near the southern boundary of the park.

—The "old" park areas established prior to ANILCA (7.5 million acres) are and have been wildlife sanctuaries since the early 1900's.

In sum, 9.6 million acres of national parkland in Alaska are closed by law to both subsistence and sport hunting, and in the remaining park lands, there are millions of acres of core wildlife sanctuaries, with light subsistence activities largely confined to the peripheries of the parks. Therefore, if the intentions of S. 49 as originally introduced were to open only the subsistence use areas to sport hunting, the amount of acreage involved would be nowhere near the 12 million acre figure in S. 49 nor would it affect virtually all the wildlife habitat areas in the national park as S. 49 does. Clearly this cannot be the real reason behind downgrading 12 million acres of national parklands to preserve status. In conclusion, Congress's support of subsistence uses in certain areas of new national parks was expressed in ANILCA. This was an exception to the rule of no hunting in national parks. The reasons for Congressional support of subsistence uses were both moral and practical: preserving the opportunity to continue a unique way of life and lack of any viable alternative for providing for the needs of these people. S. 49 attempts to distort the reasons behind the inclusion of special provisions for subsistence hunting in order to open parks of the new national parks to sport hunting.

SPORT HUNTING GIVEN FULL CONSIDERATION IN ANICLA DEBATES

Proponents of S. 49 stress that sport hunting issues were not discussed thoroughly during the Alaska Lands debates. Arguments to this effect include assertions that Congress was not aware of specific park/preserve boundaries and that hunters' interests in leaving prime habitat lands open to hunting were ignored.

These statements are simply not true. First, the designation of some areas as national preserve rather than national park is, in itself, evidence that hunters' interests were considered. Second, special management provisions specifically for sport hunters were incorporated in ANILCA. Third, in drawing park/preserve boundaries, Congress provided vast amounts of wildlife habitat to assure abundant sport hunting opportunities.

As mentioned, the use of the national preserve designation was a demonstration of Congress' willingness to compromise on the hunting issue in Alaska. At that time the national preserve designation had only been given to two other areas in the United States: Big

Cypress in Florida and Big Thicket in Texas, both of which allow oil and gas drilling as well as hunting.

Congress spent an enormous amount of time in determining the boundaries between park and preserve. This issue was subject of literally hundreds of pages of committee and floor debate. The Senate Energy Committee alone held almost 60 committee business meetings on the Alaska Lands issue and fully addressed issues of concern to hunters. Senator Jackson who chaired all of these meetings, stated at the April 15, 1983 hearings on S. 49:

> the balance we struck was fair and reasonable to all parties; and that includes those who wanted more lands closed to sport hunting and those who wanted more lands open for that purpose.

Congress established the national preserves as a compromise in order to reduce the impact of the ANILCA on sport hunting, while recognizing the importance of the remaining parks for the protection of wildlife populations. After lengthy debate and careful consideration of exactly where the park/preserve boundaries should be drawn, a compromise was reached in which 15 million acres closed to sport hunting in 1978 by executive action were opened by receiving preserve designation in the ANILCA.

The following are examples of specific park compromises that were made by Congress to assure plentiful sport hunting opportunities:

Wrangell-St. Elias

The proposal considered in the House and backed by the Alaska Coalition and the Carter Administration had approximately 50 percent of the sheep in the park and 50 percent in the preserve. In the 1978 Senate Energy Committee modifications to the House passed bill, the committee modified the park/preserve boundary of the House bill to provide for an increased level of sheep hunting (70 percent available). In the final compromise, 80 percent of the Dall sheep in the Wrangell Mountains were made available through preserve designations.

Katmai

The original Nixon-Ford park proposal consisted of two one-million acre additions to the pre-ANILCA monument, creating a 5 million acre Park sanctuary which would perpetuate a self-regulating population of brown bears. (Scientists regard Katmai National Park as critical for the brown bear's survival on the Alaskan Peninsula.) In one of the major compromises on this issue, ANILCA instead established a one million acre Becharof National Wildlife Refuge (open to sport hunting) in lieu of the southern addition to the Park. Thus, the original goal of wildlife sanctuary for the entire Katmai ecosystem was only half-realized in ANILCA.

Denali

In Denali, more than a third of the original park additions proposed by the Alaska Coalition and the Carter Administration were designated preserve by ANILCA.

Lake Clark

In another major compromise, only half of the key public access and public use areas were put in the park.

Aniakchak

The existing boundaries in Aniakchak represent ANILCA's compromise in favor of sport hunting: for every three acres of preserve there is one acre of monument. These boundaries were delineated by the Senate Energy Committee to leave the hunting areas used by both sport hunters and subsistence hunters out of the monument.

A number of special management provisions were adopted by Congress specifically to accommodate sport hunting concerns. Among them were provisions allowing hunters to continue to use aircraft and motorboats in designated wilderness areas. Hunters may also establish base camps in wilderness areas and have guaranteed access to pre-existing hunting camps and cabins.

In drawing the park/preserve boundaries, Congress strived to avoid potential conflicts between sports hunters and non-hunting recreational uses. Proponents of S. 49 contend that enactment of this legislation would not interfere with non-hunting recreational uses of these lands. Actually, some sport hunting does occur during August, when non-hunting visitor use is at its peak. (Caribou and Dall sheep season usually begins August 10th, and in 1982, moose season in the Brooks Range, as well as other parts of Alaska, began in early August. Alaska Hunting Regulations, No. 23, July 1, 1982—June 30, 1983, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.) The conflicts between sport hunters and non-hunting visitors use include: frequent air traffic to and from hunting camps that disturbs wildlife and the wilderness experience; frightened animals which are difficult or impossible to observe; the potential for visitors being injured in hunting accidents; and the unsightly gut piles, from kills, which attract bears.

Congress' 1980 division between park and preserve areas resulted in a generous amount of habitat and high percentage of animals available for sport hunting. ANILCA not only established 19 million acres of national preserve open to sport hunting but also placed 83 million acres in federal conservation system land units (76 million acres of refuges, 5 million acres of forest wilderness, and 2 million acres of national recreation or conservation areas) which permit hunting as well as protect habitat destruction through development. (Also, much of the 104 million acres of state lands and 44 million acres of native lands is open to sport hunting in Alaska.)

The 19 million acres of national preserve were selected by Congress with much input from sport hunting interests. These areas contain much of the most productive and accessible wildlife habitat in the national park system units in Alaska. In fact, these 19 million acres of national preserve contain more of the productive and usable habitat lands for brown bear, Dall sheep, moose, caribou, and goats than the 24.6 million acres of parkland which contain approximately 9 million acres of unproductive icefields and glaciers. As shown by Table I, if S. 49 as originally introduced in enacted, only 4.7 million acres would remain as protected park habitat (2 million of which would be in one park).

TABLE I.—EFFECTS OF S. 49 ON PARKS ESTABLISHED BY ANILCA, SHOWING TOTAL ACREAGE AND TOTAL USABLE HABITAT (LESS ICE AND ROCK)

[In millions of acres]

National parks	Total park acreage ANILCA	ANILCA usable habitat acreage	S. 49 acreage reduction	Remaining usable park habitat
Gates of the Arctic	7.05	7.05	−5.10	1.95
Lake Clark	2.44	1.00	−1.03	0
Wrangell-St. Elias	8.15	2.35	−2.32	.03
Kenai Fjords	.57	.11	−.57	0
Aniakchak (monument)	.14	.14	−.09	.05
Denali (additions)	2.43	1.73	−1.53	.20
Glacier Bay (additions)	.52	.38	−.21	.17
Katmai (additions)	1.04	.97	−1.04	0
Cape Krusenstern	.56	.56	0	.56
Kobuk Valley	1.71	1.71	0	1.71
Total	24.61	15.81	−11.89	4.67

Along with the bulk of the usable park habitat already in preserves most of the habitat for each of the major sport hunting species was left open to sport hunting by the ANILCA. This is depicted in Table II which shows that over 75 percent of Dall sheep habitat and over 90 percent of grizzly, moose and caribou habitat is currently open to sport hunters.

TABLE II.—PERCENTAGE OF HABITAT BY SPECIES CLOSED TO SPORT HUNTING IN ALASKA

[In percent]

	Percent of habitat in old national parks	Percent of habitat in ANILCA (new) national parks	Percent of habitat in total Alaska national parks
Brown-grizzly bear	1.6	5.1	6.7
Caribou	1.3	5.5	6.8
Dall sheep	1.4	21.1	22.5
Moose	1.1	3.3	4.4

Source: derived from "Alaska's Wildlife and Habitat," Alaska Department of Fish and Game, April 1973.

Due to the newness of the parks and the inadequacy of the Park Service budget for research and staffing, little research has been completed recently on existing wildlife populations and the effects of sport hunting. More information should become available in the next two years as the Park Service meets the statutory requirement in ANILCA and submits comprehensive park plans for each area by December 1985.

Contrary to assertions by proponents of S. 49, there are strong reasons why sport hunting is not always a proper management tool in Alaska. Natural predator-prey relationships and intact ecosystems still exist, thus natural regulatory mechanisms still function. Furthermore, sport hunting has been found to have some negative effects on the populations of Dall sheep and grizzly bear as demonstrated below. The data that has been collected on these two species points out need for protecting unhunted habitat areas for these animals. To relieve hunting pressure on Dall sheep, the size of the curl of sheep which can be taken by sport hunters was increased from two-thirds to seven-eighths in order to allow more male sheep to mature. Researchers found that the older male sheep who pioneer new habitat. The loss of these older males also weakens the gene pool. The sheep which live longer are the stronger and more adaptable ones—keeping their genes in the gene pool assures a stronger sheep population.

The same argument is true of grizzly bears. The larger and stronger ones are the primary targets of sport hungers. Hunting pressure on bears is reflected in a decrease in their average skull size. Brown bears need vast territories. In the lower 48 no entire ecosystems remain in which to study these tremendous animals in their natural condition and many wildlife biologists warn that they may disappear altogether in the continental U.S. The only places brown bear are currently found in the U.S. outside of Alaska are Glacier National Park and Yellowstone National Park.

Currently, independent research is underway at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks to study brown bear and caribou along road corridors in Denali National Park. Research is also being conducted on the Dall sheep in the gates of the Arctic. However, these projects are not yet finished.

Opening twelve million acres of national parks in Alaska to sport hunting as proposed in S. 49 as introduced or 5 million acres in S. 49 as reported is neither in the interests of hunters nor is it necessry. Proponents of S. 49 claim that opening these national parklands in Alaska to sport hunting is the most significant hunting issue in history. On the contrary, today the most vital issues for hunters are those concerning habitat preservation. Furthermore, ANILCA is one of the most pro-hunting pieces of legislation ever enacted by any Congress. Apparently, there are some who simply want it all and who are willing to sacrifice the national park concept for the rest of the nation to get what they want.

In conclusion, one must ask who would benefit from the original S. 49's redesignation of 12 million acres and the reported bill's 5 million acres of national parklands to national preserve—Alaskan tourism? guides? hunters from Alaska? hunters from the lower 48? None of these groups would appear to derive any great benefits from this legislation.

Tourism has been increasing by leaps and bounds in Alaska and the industry does not seem to have been set back by the ANILCA's national park designations. In fact, the State Division of Tourism projects that tourism, the state's second-largest source of income, will reach 1 million by 1985–1986 and that income from tourism will more than double by that time. With the average tourist spending approximately 950% more than non-resident sport hunters in Alaska in 1982, the tourism industry has no reason to complain about the current national parks. In fact, the industry has every reason to protect the national parks which draw tourists to the state.

The overall effect of the ANILCA on hunting guides has been quite limited and S. 49 is neither needed nor suited to be a form of relief for them. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game records show that 102 guides were affected by the new national parks but all of these guides had additional guiding areas, completely outside national park boundaries, which were unaffected by the ANILCA national park designations. No guides were completely without guiding areas due to ANILCA, and many continue to work as guides, some now working as non-hunting guides.

That resident Alaskans would receive a windfall from S. 49 is also inaccurate. According to estimate of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, if S. 49 is enacted only three percent of the State's resident hunters will take advantage of it.

As for hunters from the lower 48, sport hunting expeditions are so expensive (averaging $6,000 but as high as $30,000 for a "grand slam"—grizzly, moose, caribou and Dall sheep) as to prevent the average hunter from travelling to Alaska to hunt. In 1982–83 season, only 1346 out of over 16 million registered hunters from the lower 48 and Hawaii went on hunting trips in Alaska. These sport hunters will not benefit from the opening of 12 million acres of national park to sport hunting. The group that has most vociferously lobbied for S. 49 are the wealthy trophy hunters from the United States and abroad.

Appeasing this special interest group is not a good reason to change the boundaries between park and preserve. Congress thoroughly examined the areas and weighed the interests of all concerned before delineating those areas to be put in national park status and those to be labeled national preserve. As has been shown most of the habitat is already in preserve status making even less of an argument for de-designating these parklands. The ramifications of downgrading national parklands is a great threat both to the animals in the parks and to national park policy, to change these areas without good cause.

CONCLUSION

The passage of ANILCA culminated years of complex, difficult, and often stormy devisive debate and negotiations in both the Senate and the House. Countless briefings, hearings, meetings, mark-ups, and negotiations were held in Congress over a four-year period. The final shape of the compromise between park and preserve lands represented by ANILCA was accomplished only after weeks of effort by all parties.

The sport hunting issue was discussed at length and many concessions were made in order to assure that animal populations would be available to hunters. In Alaska today sport hunting opportunities abound. The existing boundaries between park and preserve are a good compromise of sport hunting and other interests. Much harm and little good can result from this legislation.

Only two and a half years have passed since ANILCA was signed. No additional research on animal populations has been gathered or analyzed which would indicate a necessity, much less an urgent need, to change these park lands to preserve status. Furthermore, the park management plans have yet to be completed.

In its attempt to open up ANILCA, S. 49 sets a dangerous precedent both for U.S. National Parks and national parks in other countries. This bill is an assault on the integrity of our national park system which may have wide ranging repercussions.

The U.S. National Park System is one of the most highly regarded in the world. Internationally, passage of S. 49 will diminish the integrity of our park system as other countries see how easily it can be dismantled for commercial purposes.

The following section is a park by park analysis of the effect S. 49 as originally introduced would have. (Note that in the bill as reported the following parks have been deleted: Gates of the Arctic National Park, Kenai Fjords National Park, Glacier Bay National Park, Katmai National Park.)

DENALI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

Mount McKinley at 20,320 feet, is North America's highest mountain. The Athapascan Indians call it Denali, "the High One," and in 1980 the national park's name was changed to Denali.

> Mount McKinley is a massive mountain—measured from base to summit the world's highest—and the towering centerpiece of the glacier-strewn Alaska Range. Under its shadow in Denali National Park and Preserve are barren-ground caribou, grizzly bears, wolves, moose, Dall sheep, and other wildlife. Meandering, glacier-born rivers laden with silt (or rock flour) create natural dams and periodically change course across their wide, flat valleys. (National Parklands of Alaska, U.S. Department of the Interior USGPO, 1982)

Purposes

The Alaska Lands Act (Section 202(3)(a)) sets forth the purposes of the expanded Park as follows:

> To protect and interpret the entire mountain massif, and additional scenic mountain peaks and formations; and to protect habitat for, and populations of fish and wildlife including, but not limited to, brown/grizzly bears, moose, caribou, Dall sheep, wolves, swans and other waterfowl; and to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access, for mountain climbing, mountaineering and other wilderness recreational activities. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the additions to the park where such uses are traditional in accordance with the provisions in title VIII.

According to a 1979 Senate Energy Committee Report (p. 166), "The prime resource for which the north addition is established is the critical range necessary to support populations of moose, wolf, and caribou as part of an integral ecosystem." According to the House Interior Committee:

> Lowland areas in the southern addition provide ecologic diversity and opportunity for recreation and access. The Chelatna Lake area would provide much improved access for the people of Anchorage to the area in a setting that is

> extremely scenic and educational. A possible cooperative development site with the State at the foot of the Tikasitna (sic) Glacier would provide similar opportunities. Activities originating at these sites can include scenic viewing, camping, hiking, backpacking, nature study, photography, and mountain climbing. Also included in the southern lowlands is a small unit of critically important caribou habitat.

Also, the House Committee noted:

> The north addition places in the park sufficient habitat to sustain park wildlife populations that presently roam in and out of the original park. This addition provides vital habitat for the McKinley caribou herd, which has provided a basis for scientific study since the early twentieth century. Associated with the herd in this ecosystem are other scientifically important mammals such as grizzly bear, wolf, and wolverine. The Toklat River region includes a unique area of warm springs which attracts an unusual late run of Chum salmon. This run provides an important late fall food source for the area's grizzly bear population—the subject of many scientific studies. (House Committee Report 1979, pp. 403–405)

Impact of S. 49

The bill would change 1,526,000 acres of the park's ANILCA additions, or 63 percent, to preserve:

	Existing (additions) [1]	S. 49
Park	2,426,000	900,000
Preserve	1,330,000	2,856,000
Total	3,756,000	3,756,000

[1] These are ANILCA additions to pre-ANILCA park of 1.9 million acres.

This 63 percent figure is, however, very misleading because the real impact of the bill is that virtually 100 percent of the new park's wildlife habitat is opened to sport hunting. Left in park status is the southern side of the Mt. McKinley massif, which is comprised of glaciers, spires, and miles-high peaks. Thus the proponents of S. 49 are proposing to do away with all of the truly valuable new parkland. This pattern of habitat removal, leaving only ice and rock in the remaining park, is repeated again and again in S. 49.

In dropping the entire northern addition, S. 49 would totally negate Congress's intent to give sanctuary to the park's wildlife as it moves back and forth between the northern addition and the "old" core park known as Mt. McKinley prior to the Alaska Lands Act.

Similarly, S. 49's surgery on the south addition would eliminate all the accessible parkland and rule out the major visitor center wildlife viewing area in the Tokositna Glacier area envisioned by

Congress. This part of the south addition is slated to be the most important park visitor area in the entire 5.7 million acre park.

A National Park Service survey of the wildlife resources of the Tokositna area by the NPS's Chief wildlife biologist—and one of the most experienced biologists in Alaska—found "a spectacular display of wildlife," especially on the immediately adjacent Denali State Park Portion of the Tokositna River flats:

> In the flats just south of where the Ruth Glacier joins the Tokositna River, I counted 52 moose standing out in the open green flats. Another 40 were scattered on the flats north of Bunco Lake to Tokositna Glacier. *I have seen many moose before but have found few concentration like these in Alaska so readily visible.* (Emphasis added)

The full Report follows:

> Reply to attention of: Management Biologist, Alaska.
>
> Subject: Tokositna Wildlife Survey.
>
> To: Area Director, Alaska.
>
> On June 21, 1979, I surveyed the river flats in front of the Tokositna Glacier. I flew the area between 0715 and 0815. My primary purpose was to record trumpeter swans nesting in the area. I was pleasantly surprised to not only find trumpeter swans but a spectacular display of wildlife.
>
> Currently, the flats are green with sedges and grasses interspersed with many ponds and small lakes. In the flats just south of where the Ruth River joins the Tokositna River I counted 52 moose standing out in the open green flats. Another 40 were scattered on the flats north of Bunco Lake to the Tokositna Glacier. I have seen many moose before but have found few concentrations like these in Alaska so readily visible.
>
> In the same area I found 5 active trumpeter swan nests (see maps for exact location) and in addition small groups of non-nesters were scattered throughout the flats. I counted a total of 16 non-nesting. In addition several potholes north of Bunco Lake had large concentrations of dabbling ducks. Beaver are abundant and their dams and houses are numerous. I also saw one black bear and in the past have seen grizzlies in the same valley.
>
> It strikes me that this is an exceedingly valuable valley of wildlife that will need close attention in any developments that are planned in the general area, as you can see by the map, most of the wildlife observed was just outside of the National Monument boundaries and falls into the Denali State Park; however, I understand National Park Service personnel will be cooperating with the State of Alaska in planning tourist facilities. My general impression is that a road through the valley floor would be disastrous but one skirting the ridge above the flats would make wildlife readily visible without disturbing it.
>
> An early morning or late evening aerial survey would be the best time to observe the wildlife if anyone is interested.

> I would recommend further ground and aerial surveys to completely evaluate the wildlife inhabiting the area.
>
> WILL TROYER.

This Tokositna area, along with the rest of the wildlife habitat portion of the southern addition, would be completely changed to preserve by S. 49. Park animals that thave been accustomed to sanctuary since 1978, when President Carter established the Denali Monument, would become gun-shy, and the unique wildlife observation experience envisioned by Congress for this area would be sacrificed to the demands of one special interest group. If enacted, S. 49 would also encourage the State to open the adjacent Denali State Park to big game hunting. (State parks are a mix of hunting and no-hunting areas.)

S. 49 would also take out of park status a part of the southern addition used by the McKinley caribou herd during its post-calving period. In fact, all of the herd's range in the additions would be dropped from park status. Because this herd is now severely reduced in numbers, its ultimate recovery may depend on it being not subjected to sport hunting as it moves across the park additions.

WRANGELL-ST. ELIAS NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

This 17-million-acre complex of park and preserve is the nation's largest national park system unit. Together with the adjacent Kluane National Park of Canada, it has been designated an International Biosphere Reserve.

All or parts of four major mountain ranges are included within the park-preserve boundaries: all of the Wrangell Mountains, a substantial part of the Chugach Mountains, and portions of the eastern Alaskan and St. Elias Ranges. Stupendous 16,000-ft. peaks, icefields, snowfields, and glaciers dominate the landscape. Some of the largest, longest, and most active glaciers in the world are found here. Their melt waters supply the complex's large braided river systems, including the Copper and Chitina, which are among the nation's largest.

Recreation opportunities abound in this mix of rugged high mountain country, remote valleys, free-flowing rivers, diverse and exemplary populations of wildlife, and coastal beaches. Much of the northern portion of the unit is bounded by State highways, and two roads penetrate into the north-central portions, offering opportunities for road-oriented recreation as well as jumping-off points for wilderness travelers.

Wildlife resources of the park-preserve were described in the House Interior Committee's Report of 1979 (p. 47):

> The diversity of landforms from seacoast to high mountains, provides habitats for an excellent representation of the fauna of interior Alaska. Dall sheep, brown and black bear, moose, mountain goat, caribou, bison, and wolf are all found here. Of special interest is the large coastal fringe along the Malaspina Glacier, where the biotic components of the interior intermingle with those of the

> coast—sea lion, otter, harbor seal, and several species of whales inhabit waters adjacent to the park. *The valleys and lowlands of the unit are also particularly important, supporting a diverse spectrum of biologic communities which are evolving in direct response to changing natural conditions and the advance and retreat of the glaciers.* (Emphasis added.)

Purpose

According to Section 201(9) of ANILCA, this unit is to be managed for the following purposes, among others:

> To maintain unimpaired the scenic beauty and quality of high mountain peaks, foothills, glacial systems, lakes, and streams, valleys, and coastal landscapes in their natural state; to protect habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife including but not limited to caribou, brown/grizzly bears, Dall sheep, moose, wolves, trumpeter swans and other waterfowl, and marine mammals; and to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access for mountain climbing, mountaineering, and other wilderness recreational activities. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses are traditional, in accordance with the provisions of Title VIII.

Impact of S. 49

S. 49 would open 2,322,000 acres of the park to sport hunting:

	Existing	S. 49
Park	8,147,000	5,825,000
Preserve	4,171,000	6,493,000
Total	12,318,000	12,318,000

In analyzing the effect of this bill on the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park one must be aware that there are both national and international ramifications. There are two key relationships within the park that are noteworthy. First, the existing park is overwhelmingly high-altitude ice, rock, and snowfields. Only about 28 percent of the park is habitat as defined by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. S. 49 proposes to change about 90 percent of this park habitat to preserve lands. S. 49 removes most of the existing lowland habitat portions of the park. Only the Copper-Tanada Lakes and the Bremmer River valley are left in park status. Both areas are encumbered by native inholdings that could lead to future incompatible developments which would degrade their value as protected wildlife habitat.

Second, as is apparent from the habitat/non-habitat division noted above, most of the wildlife of interest to sport hunters is already in the existing preserve. For example, the park-preserve complex is home to the nation's largest specimens of Dall sheep. A recent National Park Service/Alaska Department of Fish and Game study shows that 81 percent of the Dall sheep are found in the existing preserve and thus are available to trophy hunters. S. 49

would put nearly 100 percent of the sheep in an enlarged preserve. In the original 1977 Alaska Lands bill considered by the House and backed by the Carter administration and conservation organizations, about half of the Dall sheep were allocated to park, half to preserve. But the final compromise, in the Wrangells left four sheep in the preserve for every one in the park. Thus S. 49 would destroy the compromise on sport hunting in ANILCA that already overwhelmingly favors sport hunting interests. It is a measure of the extreme nature of S. 49 that it includes nearly all of the rest of the sheep, and most of the other park wildlife as well.

Of equal importance are the international implications of opening parts of this national park to hunting. The Wrangell-St. Elias National Park directly joins Klunane National Park along the U.S.-Canada border. These two magnificent parks were the first joint nomination of a World Heritage Site under the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. The World Heritage Convention designation of this area is not merely a symbolic designation. Recently the Australian High Court prevented the construction of a hydroelectric dam on the Franklin River, an area designated a World Heritage Site, by the state government of Tasmania. Several Canadian conservation groups have voiced their opposition to S. 49's designation of the U.S. National Parks in general and the Wrangells in particular.

LAKE CLARK NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

Lake Clark National Park and Preserve has been called the Alps of Alaska. The Park contains great geologic diversity for it is where the Alaskan and Aleutian Ranges meet. The jagged peaks, glaciers and 50-mile long Lake Clark provide a beautiful variety of scenery. According to the House Interior Committee in its 1979 House Committee Report (pp. 412–413):

> The Lake Clark area straddles both the Alaska and Aleutian Mountain Ranges. On the south end is Lake Clark, 50 miles in length, on the north is rugged Merrill Pass, and to the west is a series of glacier-created lakes. The region is large and intricate, mostly unexplored, and with a wide spectrum of outdoor opportunities. Interior Department studies of the Lake Clark region began in the early 1950's, and a Lake Clark Pass National Park was proposed for further study in this area, which has been frequently referred to as the Switzerland of Alaska.
>
> Mountains, lakes, rivers and woodlands support a diverse range of fish and wildlife populations, and offer varied recreation and educational opportunities. Scores of waterfalls cascade down mountain slopes. Numerous valleys weave through a jumble of mountain peaks, often meeting other drainages in low passes, resulting in a maze of natural hiking and climbing routes which permit access to a spectacular mountain environment where two major mountain ranges (the Alaska and Aleutian) intersect in a medley of rugged spires, glaciers, and volcanoes. Two vol-

canoes, Mount Redoubt and Mount Iliamna, have been added to the National Registry [sic] of National Landmarks, and Lake Clark Pass has been recommended for natural landmark status. The still-smoking volcanoes are impressive reminders of the geologic forces that continue to shape much of Alaska's skyline. Immediately west of the Chigmit Mountains is a string of beautiful turquoise-colored lakes nestled against the mountain flanks.

The vegetation and wildlife are as diverse as the topography. Brown and black bear, trout, moose, salmon and Dall sheep can be found within the areas. The Mulchatna caribou herd feeds and calves on the tundra plains and hills in the western portion. Plant communities range from the Cook Inlet coastal lowlands of spruce, marches, and swamps to the alpine meadows and lichen growth of the mountainous areas and include the most southern known in holding of the arctic tundra biome. The foothills region west of the lake country supports a complex of many small lakes, ponds, and marshes that along with tundra supplies a varied habitat for caribou, moose, waterfowl, and fish. Marine life such as harbor seals, Beluga whales, and otters canbe observed feeding near the river mouths along the Cook Inlet coast. The area includes a headwaters portion of the Iliamna-Kvichak [sic] watershed—an extremely important part of the world famous Bristol Bay red sockeye salmon fishery.

Purposes

According to Section 201(7)(a) of ANILCA:

> The park and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To protect the watershed necessary for perpetuation of the red salmon fishery in Bristol Bay; to maintain unimpaired the scenic beauty and quality of portions of the Alaska Range and the Aleutian Range, including active volcanoes, glaciers, wild rivers, lakes, waterfalls, and alpine meadows in their natural state; and to protect habitat for an populations of fish and wildlife including but not limited caribou, Dall sheep, brown/grizzly bears, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons . . . subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses are traditional, in accordance with the provisions of Title VIII.

Impact of S. 49

S. 49 would redesignate 1,025,000 acres of the park as national preserve open to sport hunting:

	Existing	S. 49
Park	2,439,000	1,414,000
Preserve	1,214,000	2,239,000
Total	3,653,000	3,653,000

S. 49 would convert most of Lake Clark Park's lowland areas and wildlife habitat to preserve status. During the Committee's markup, a Department of the Interior spokesman estimated that 80 percent of the habitat now in park would be preserve under S. 49. The percentage may be even higher based on the State of Alaska's Wildlife Habitat Atlas.

In any case, S. 49 would leave in park status mostly the unaccessible and very high back country, including glacier-clad peaks, icefields, and volcanoes of the Alaska-Aleutian Range.

In promoting their ice and rock "park," proponents of the bill are out to destroy one of the major compromises in ANILCA on the sport hunting/national park issue. After extensive debate and votes in the Senate and House Committees, Congress decided to put about half of the key access, public use, and wildlife habitat areas in the preserve and half in the park, notwithstanding the existing ratio of two park acres to one preserve acre. (As noted above, much of the existing park is ice-covered.)

This is 50-50 compromise is most meaningful on the west side of the park/preserve along the string of turquoise-colored lakes nestled against the steep embankment of the Alaska-Aleutian Ranges. In the existing park, these lakes are about evenly divided between park and preserve: Two Lakes, Telequana, lower Lake Clark, and Tazimina Lakes in the preserve; Turquoise, Twin Lakes, upper Lake Clark, and Kontrashibuna Lake in the park.

S. 49 would take all of these lakes now in park, including the surrounding accessible lands, and make them preserve. Despite the fact that under S. 49 there would remain 1.4 million icy acres in park status, for all practical purposes, the bill would overthrow Congress' careful balancing of park and preserve in the Alaska Lands Act.

ANIAKCHAK NATIONAL MONUMENT AND PRESERVE

Description

The central feature of Aniakchak is the caldera which was created by the collapse of the central part of a volcano sometime after the last glaciation. Later activity built the existing cone. The following description of Aniakchak is from the 1979 House Committee Report (pp. 400-401):

> The Aniakchak Caldera is located in the heart of the Alaska Peninsula. It is so unexpected a feature that it remained unknown to all but the Natives of the region until about 1920. With its average diameter of approximately six miles, Aniakchak is one of the world's largest calderas.
>
> In the interior of the caldera are textbook examples of certain volcanic features such as lava flows, cinder cones, and explosion pits. Also lying within the caldera is Surprise Lake which is fed by warm springs and is uniquely charged with chemicals. Surprise Lake is the source of the Aniakchak River, which cascades through a 1,500 foot gash in the caldera wall and downward for 27 miles to the Pacific Ocean.

The flanks of the caldera provide a geological and biological continuum by which to make a comparative study of the formation of the caldera and the significant process of biological succession of both plant and animal species occurring in the vicinity of the caldera, an area that was rendered virtually devoid of life forms by a major eruption of the volcano in 1931.

The caldera is also climatologically unique in that, because of its topography and setting, it appears to be able to generate its own weather. A striking phenomenon known as cloud "niagaras" occurs frequently as strong downdrafts form over the caldera walls.

Brown bears and moose are found throughout the area with concentrations along the streams and bays on the eastern coast in the national preserve. The cliffs and offshore islands harbor oceanic birds, sea lions, sea otters, and seals. The gentle mountains to the east northeast provide backcountry hiking opportunities.

Purposes

Aniakchak was established as a monument "to solicit and provide for public use and enjoyment of one of the world's great dry volcanic calderas, its environs and the Aniakchak River." (Senate Energy Committee Report, 1979.)

According to Section 201(1) of ANILCA this unit is to be managed for the following purposes, among others:

> To maintain the caldera and its associated volcanic features and landscape, including the Aniakchak River and other lakes and streams, in their natural state; to study, interpret, and assure continuation of the natural process of biological succession; to protect habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife, including, but not limited to, brown/grizzly bears, moose, caribou, sea lions, seals, and other marine mammals, geese, swans, and other waterfowl and in a manner consistent with the foregoing, to interpret geological and biological processes for visitors.
>
> Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the monument where such uses are traditional in accordance with the provisions of Title VIII.

Impact of S. 49

According to the sponsors of S. 49, their bill would open 88,000 acres of the Monument to sport hunting. 50,000 acres would remain in the Monument:

	Existing	S. 49
Monument	138,000	[1] 50,000
Preserve	376,000	464,000
Total	514,000	514,000

[1] This acreage figure in S. 49 does not match the map submitted to the Committee by the bill's sponsors. Aniakchak Crater, i.e., the floor of the caldera, is approximately 20,000 acres in size. It is the only area not changed to preserve by the bill, according to the map.

The map of this area shows that the existing Monument contains largely the steep cinder-covered cone of the caldera. Surrounding the caldera cone are the lush, wildlife-rich lowlands of the existing preserve, Native-owned lands, and State lands favored by hunters.

In doing away with most of the existing Monument, S. 49 takes an extreme and unnecessary step because the existing monument/preserve boundaries represent a major compromise that already overwhelmingly favors sport hunters.

The Senate Energy Committee's 1978-79 park/preserve boundaries—which ultimately became law—were designed to leave areas used by both sport and subsistence hunters out of the Monument altogether. (Senate Committee Report, 1979, p. 140 (emphasis added). The House-passed bill split the unit more evenly between monument and preserve.

To ensure that the ANILCA monument/preserve boundary did not preclude periodic subsistence use of the Monument, subsistence hunting was permitted in the Monument in those areas where it had traditionally taken place. According to an Interior Department spokesman during the Committee's recent mark-up, currently some occasional subsistence hunting occurs on the north and northwest margin of the monument, when the Alaska Peninsula caribou herd wanders over into the Monument during hunting season.

Thus, S. 49's Aniakchak proposal is extreme in light of ANILCA's boundaries. The most productive wildlife areas are already in the Preserve and thus open to sport hunting. Besides Aniakchak, regionally sport hunters have available 5–6 million acres on the Alaska Peninsula that contain some of the best big-game and waterfowl hunting in the world. The relatively few animals that visit the caldera/monument should be left for the enjoyment of non-hunting visitors.

GATES OF THE ARCTIC NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

Gates of the Arctic National Park, in Alaska's central Brooks Range, is a 7 million acre wild region of superlative natural beauty and exceptional scientific value, the last such essentially untouched mountain area of its scale in the United States.

The park is characterized by a maze of deep glaciated valleys and gaunt and rugged mountains, culminating in Mount Igipak, highest peak in the central Brooks Range. Many of the summits and waterways remain nameless, but the sources and major segments of seven wild rivers are in the Park: North Fork of Koyukuk, Tinayguk, John, Killik, upper Kobuk, Alatna, and the Noatak. Two special resources, Walker Lake and Arrigetch Peaks, are on the National Register of Natural Landmarks, and 11 other features have been suggested for national landmark status.

Although the boreal forest reaches up the southern drainages, with stands of spruce and birch, most of the park area is tundra-clad. Park valleys serve as migration routes for the western Arctic caribou herd, and are prime habitat for the barren-ground grizzly bear, Dall sheep and wolf, all of which require extensive pristine ranges. The park also has important nesting grounds for peregrine falcons, gyrfalcons, eagles and other raptors. Its waters support grayling, lake trout, arctic char, and northern pike. Gates of the Arctic National Park, all of which is also in the Wilderness System, is managed as a natural area of the National Park System.

Purposes

As set forth in Section 201(4)(a) of the Alaska Lands Act:

> The park and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To maintain the wild and undeveloped character of the area, including opportunities for visitors to experience solitude, and the natural environmental integrity and scenic beauty of the mountains, forelands, rivers, lakes, and other natural features; to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access, for mountain climbing, mountaineering, and other wilderness recreational activities; and to protect habitat for and the populations of, fish and wildlife, including, but not limited to, caribou, grizzly bears, Dall sheep, moose, wolves, and raptorial birds. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses are traditional, in accordance with the provisions of Title VIII.

Impact of S. 49

S. 49 would open 5,099,000 acres of this 7,052,000-acre park to sport hunting:

	Existing	S. 49
Park	7,052,000	1,953,000
Preserve	900,000	5,999,000
Total	7,952,000	7,952,000

S. 49 would leave in national park status only two relatively small islands of parks in a sea of national preserve. There would no longer be a wildlife sanctuary in the Arctic large enough to sustain the wide-ranging populations of barren-ground grizzly bears, caribou, wolves, and other species dependent on vast undeveloped rangelands. For despite some limited subsistence hunting by a relatively few local residents (a topic treated at greater length in a previous section of these dissenting views) the bulk of the park does provide habitat of sufficient size to enable the park's wildlife to be self-regulating and self-sustaining.

In place of a park that now contains the largest amount of wildlife habitat and usable parkland in the nation (Wrangell-St. Elias National Park at 8.15 million acres is larger, but only about 20% is usable lowland habitat) S. 49 would leave only two widely separated park units covering portions of two river valleys. S. 49's proposed destruction of Gates as a vast park sanctuary would mean that there would be no place left in the entire American Arctic where discrete populations of Dall sheep, wolves, bears and other species would be fully protected.

Such a turn of events would be especially regrettable in view of the opportunities for superb trophy sport hunting in the rest of the Brooks Range: to the east in the 18 million acre Arctic National

Wildlife Refuge, and to the west in the upper Noatak National Preserve and the mountainous portions of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska. Other areas in Alaska such as the Wrangells and the Alaska Range also offer trophy Dall Sheep hunting.

S. 49's impact on the wildlife-viewing experience now enjoyed by park visitors would be devastating. Some of the most important and wildlife-rich river valleys, used by park visitors such as the Killik, John, and upper Alatna, would be turned over to the sport hunters during August and early September (Dall sheep and moose seasons open in early August) which is also the peak visitor season. During hunting season, and even during June and July, the non-hunting part of the visitor season, the opportunity to view unhunted and thus less "gun-shy" wildlife will have been severely reduced, if not lost altogether.

KATMAI NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

A major purpose in the establishment of Katmai National Park was to protect a major population of brown bears. This unit is intended to be one of the larger "sanctuaries where wildlife may roam freely developing their social structures and evolving over long periods of time as nearly as possible without the changes that extensive human activities would cause."

Katmai National Park and Preserve was known as the Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes after a tremendous volcanic eruption in 1912 which created millions of fumaroles that issued hot steam. Today only a few active vents remain and the volcanic crater contains a lake. The following description from the 1979 House Committee Report (pp. 409–410) depicts some of the more significant aspects of this area:

> In 1912, Mount Katmai gave to an extremely violent volcanic eruption. To preserve this excellent example of recent volcanic and ash deposition, Katmai National Monument was established in 1918. In the ensuing years it was recognized that in addition to the volcanoes, the area included a significant population of Alaskan brown bear and important spawning grounds for the Bristol Bay red salmon. The area was enlarged in view of these features in 1931, 1942, 1969, and 1978.
>
> Continued research hasd revealed that the bear population is more mobile than originally believed. Through confirmation and redesignation as a national park of the 1978 national monument addition, a viable gene-pool population of the Alaskan brown bear can be protected free from human harassment. The addition closes a fifteen mile gap between the former monument boundary and the McNeil River State Game Sanctuary thereby completing the protection of the range of this population of the world's largest carnivore.
>
> The enlargement also protects the headwaters of the drainages which provide the spawning grounds for the red salmon. By protecting the quality of the water in these wa-

> tersheds, the drama of the salmon run, a phenomenon of great scientific interest over the years, may be perpetuated. The northern part of the park preserve will also offer many back-country recreation opportunities amidst highly scenic and varied types of terrain forms rolling tundra, wooded valleys, and alpine lakes to rugged snow and glacier-clad peaks. Pristine watersheds necessary for support of the red salmon fishery and water quality protection within the existing monument are included within the addition.

Purposes

According to Section 202(2) of ANILCA this unit is to be managed for the following purposes among others:

> To protect habitat for, and populations of fish and wildlife including, but not limited to, high concentrations of brown/grizzly bears and their denning areas; to maintain unimpaired the water habitat for significant salmon populations; and to protect scenic, geological, cultural and recreational features.

Impact of S. 49

The bill would convert the entire 1,037,000-acre national park addition to national preserve in order to allow sport hunting:

	Existing (additions) [1]	S. 49
Park	1,037,000	0
Preserve	308,000	1,345,000
Total	1,345,000	1,345,000

[1] Those are additions in ANILCA to pre-ANILCA park of 2.8 million acres. This action would negate Congress' objective in ANILCA, which as the House indicated in the above discussion, was to give park protection to critically important habitat used by the Alaska brown bears of Katmai.

With the addition open to sport hunting under S. 49, Katmai's bears would once again be exposed to the commercial hunting guides and trophy hunters as these bears moved back and forth between the relatively tiny State game sanctuary at McNeill River and the "old" pre-ANILCA Katmai park, recreating the former "firing line." The Reagan-Watt administration agrees that the park's northern addition is necessary to protect the wide-ranging bears of Katmai. Accordingly, the administration does not support the Alaska congressional delegation's attempt in S. 49 to conceal the addition.

In one of the major compromises in ANILCA on the hunting issue, Congress established a one-million acre Becharof National Wildlife Refuge (open to sport hunting) in lieu of a southern addition to the Katmai Park, as originally recommended by the Nixon-Ford Administration. The original proposal consisted of two one-million acre additions to the pre-ANILCA park designed to create a 5 million acre Park sanctuary. This original goal of wildlife sanctuary (park status) for the entire Katmai ecosystem was only half-realized in ANILCA through the northern park addition.

Another smaller compromise favoring sport hunting interests was placing 308,000 acres of the north addition in preserve status. Besides these compromises favoring the sport hunting interest, there are many other excellent brown bear trophy hunting areas elsewhere in the Bristol Bay region and in Alaska. The nearby Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge is the pre-eminent trophy brown bear hunting area in the nation. The entire Alaska Peninsula below Katmai is one of the nation's best and most popular areas for trophy-size brown bears. Numerous other national preserves, wildlife refuges, and state lands also offer excellent brown bear hunting.

GLACIER BAY NATIONAL PARK AND PRESERVE

Description

The 580,000 acre Glacier Bay contains some of the world's most impressive examples of coastal glaciers. There have been four major advances and four major retreats of glaciers in this area. Due to the rapid advance and retreat of the glaciers, there is a great variety in plant and animal life. The following description of Glacier Bay from the 1979 House Committee Report (p. 402) details many of the interesting facts about this area:

> Glacier Bay encompasses a dramatic landscape of coastal mountains undergoing uniquely rapid and dynamic glacial fluctuations. While the fastest retreat of glacial ice in history continues to occurs in the area, other glaciers within the boundaries are today reclaiming territory from the pioneering plants and animals which had begun inhabiting postglacial areas.
>
> The 1978 monument addition included the northwesterly side of Mount Fairweather, the highest peak in this part of Alaska, and the Grand Plateau Glacier—both significant to students of glaciology.
>
> The Alsek River corridor, which was added to the monument in 1978, provides the only pass through the coastal mountain range for 120 miles. This is the route by which large mammals first entered this isolated area and is used by a significant percentage of the Alaska bald eagle population en route to wintering grounds in the Klukwan area.
>
> The Alsek River and its tributary, the Tatshenshini, have high potential for white water recreation and constitute major international natural resources. Rising high in the St. Elias Mountains in Canada, the Alsek tumbles to the sea through tight canyons offering a supreme test to the white water enthusiast, while Tatshenshini offers an easier route. Recreational use of the river has been increasing in recent years as it has become better known.
>
> The additional also protects two botanically significant areas. In the hills flanking Grand Plateau Glacier live the oldest plant communities in southeast Alaska which survive because the area escaped both glaciation and inundation. Also important to the study of ecological succession

are the mature aquatic vegetative communities of the preneoglacial lakes in the Deception Hills area.

Purposes

According to Section 201(1) of ANILCA this unit is to be managed for the following purposes, among others:

> To protect a segment of the Alsek River, fish and wildlife habitats and migration routes, and portion of the Fairweather Range including the northwest slope of Mount Fairweather. Lands, waters, and interests therein within the boundary of the park and preserve which were within the boundary of any national forest are hereby excluded from such national forest and the boundary of such national forest is hereby revised accordingly.

Glacier Bay's park and preserve additions were established primarily to protect key range used by the park wildlife as they roamed in and out of the pre-Alaska Lands Act park.

According to the Senate Energy Committee, "the 120-mile stretch of beach between Lituya and Yakutat Bays is a rich biological island" that is closely guarded by coastal mountain ranges and is accessible only through the Alsek River Valley." This "Alsek Addition," according to the Committee, is closely related to the ecology of the old Glacier Bay Monument. The Alsek addition was viewed by the Committee as a "vital segment" for addition to the park in order to protect "prime habitat" for moose, bears and wolves.

Impact of S. 49

S. 49 would redesignate 214,000 acres of park to national preserve status:

	Existing (additions) [1]	S. 49
Park	523,000	309,000
Preserve	57,000	271,000
Total	580,000	580,000

[1] These are additions in ANILCA to pre-ANILCA park of 23.8 million acres.

Most of both the pre-ANILCA park and park addition consists of tremendous glacier-clad peaks and other inaccessible areas that are neither habitat nor used by park visitors. The usable habitat in the addition consists of the Alsek River Valley (park) and the Dry Bay Area (preserve), and a thin strip of park extending south along the coast to the "old" park boundary. S. 49 would eliminate park status for the lowland habitat and leave the ice and snow-covered nonhabitat in the park.

The existing boundary between park and preserve splits the Deception Hills in half. Proponents of S. 49 argue that the entire Deception Hills area should be preserve so that boundary is readily discernable in the field. But the boundary could also be moved north to the Doame River, which would place the Deception Hills in the Park. As it is presently, the boundary, while not ideal, runs along streams and ridgetops and thus, is discernible in the field.

S. 49 would create a conflict between sport hunters and park visitors during hunting season, because the park areas S. 49 would change to preserve are those of most interest to visitors. For example, the Alsek River Valley, now park, is used by increasing numbers of visitors who float down the spectacularly scenic Alsek and Tatsenshini Rivers from Canada. Already the Park Service has had to limit commercial rafters to pe-ANILCA levels.

KENAI FJORDS NATIONAL PARK

Description

Kenai Fjords contains the dramatic seaward interface for the Harding Icefield. This icefield is believed to be a remnant of the Pleistocene ice masses that at one time covered half the state of Alaska. Along the coast of the Fjords are remnants of mountains which each day inch imperceptibly into the sea under the geologic forces of the North Pacific tectonic plate. The following description of the Kenai Fjords, from the 1979 House Committee Report (p. 403), details the magnificence of this area:

> One of the four major icecaps in the United States today, the Harding Icefield continues to carry deep glacial valleys through the Kenai Mountains. Three glaciers flow from the icefield into the present fjords, where they frequently carry huge blocks of ice into the sea. On adjacent headlands, a moss-covered spruce reinforest clings tenaciously to steep rocky slopes amidst the cool, moist climate which created and sustains the icefield above. At this interface of land and sea, marine mammals and seabirds abound. Steller sea lion and harbor seal haul out on ledges and warm in the sun of mid-summer days; killer whale, porpoise, and sea otter swim just offshore. Puffins, gulls and other seabirds inhabit rocks and cliffs by the tens of thousands, while eagles nest in trees overlooking the edible riches of the tidal fringe. The abundant life of the intertidal zone supports many of the larger animals mentioned above. Shoreward from the Park's eight major bays, black bear, wolverine, river otter, and mountain goats are found. The scenic quality of the fjords in outstanding and its potential for marine-oriented recreation such as sport fishing and boating is excellent.

Purposes

Kenai Fjords National Park was established to insure the preservation, interpretation and study of its spectacular interrelated icefield and fjord/rainforest system and its associated population of seabirds and marine mammals.

According to Section 201(5) of ANILCA, this unit is to be managed for the following purposes among others:

> To maintain unimpaired the scenic and environmental integrity of the Harding Icefield, its outflowing glaciers, and coastal fjords and islands in their natural state; and to protect seals, sea lions, other marine mammals, and marine and other birds and to maintain their hauling and

breeding areas in their natural state, free of human activity which is disruptive to their natural processes.

Impact of S. 49

S. 49 would redesignate the entire 567,000-acre park as a national preserve:

	Existing	S.49
Park	567,000	0
Preserve	0	567,000
Total	567,000	567,000

Prior to its establishment, the park received light sport hunting—mainly for mountain goats—and no subsistence hunting. It is one of three new park units closed to subsistence hunting under ANILCA.

In the two and one-half years since its establishment, Kenai Fjords National Park has become increasingly popular. Air-taxi and charter boat operators in nearby Seward are pomoting the park as a place where both marine and terrestrial wildlife can be easily observed in scenically magnificent fjords. Seward is an easy 2-hour drive from the Anchorage area, where half the State's population resides.

Kenai Fjords is one of only three new ANILCA parks that provide sanctuary for mountain goats. (The other new units are portions of Wrangell-St. Elias and the new addition to Glacier Bay National Park.) By redesignating the existing one as a Preserve, S. 49 would eliminate this sanctuary for mountain goats, and for other species gradually becoming accustomed to the presence of humans as visitors meaning no harm. The present opportunities to view these animals at close hand would be forgone, even in the non-hunting seasons, as the animals become once again wary and secretive.

PAUL E. TSONGAS.
JOHN H. CHAFEE.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 12 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill S. 49 as ordered reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

PUBLIC LAW 96-487, 96th CONGRESS

AN ACT To provide for the designation and conservation of certain public lands in the State of Alaska, including the designation of units of the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, National Forest National Wild and Scenic Rivers, and National Wilderness Preservation Systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act".

* * * * * * *

TITLE II—NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW AREAS

SEC. 201. The following areas are hereby established as units of the National Park System and shall be administered by the Secretary under the laws governing the administration of such lands and under the provisions of this Act:

(1) Aniakchak National Monument, containing approximately [one hundred and thirty-eight thousand acres of public lands, and Aniakchak National Preserve, containing approximately three hundred and seventy-six thousand acres of public lands, as generally depicted on map numbered ANIA-90,005, and dated October 1978.] *fifty thousand acres of public lands, and Aniakchak National Preserve, containing approximately four hundred sixty-four thousand acres of public lands as generally depicted on map numberd AK-1000, and dated August 10, 1982, which shall be on file and available for inspection in the offices of the Secretary.* The monument and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To maintain the caldera and its associated volcanic features and landscape, including the Aniakchak River and other lakes and streams, in their natural state; to study, interpret, and assure continuation of the natural process of biological succession; to protect habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife, including, but not limited to, brown/grizzly bears, moose, caribou, sea lions, seals, and other marine mammals, geese, swans, and other waterfowl and in a manner consistent with the foregoing, to interpret geological and biological processes for visitors. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the monument where such uses are traditional in accordance with the provisions of title VIII.

* * * * * * *

(7)(a) Lake Clark, National Park, containing approximately [two million four hundred thirty-nine thousand acres of public lands, and Lake Clark National Preserve, containing approximately one million two hundred and fourteen thousand acres of public lands, as generally depicted on map numbered LACL-90,008, and dated October 1978.] *One million four hundred fourteen thousand acres of public lands, and Lake Clark National Preserve, containing approximately two million two hundred thirty-nine thousand three hundred fifty acres of public lands, as generally depicted on map numbered AK-1000, and dated August 10, 1982, which shall be on file and available for inspection in the offices of the Secretary.* The park and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To protect the watershed necessary for perpetuation of the red salmon fishery in Bristol Bay; to maintain unimpaired the scenic beauty and quality of portions of the Alaska Range and the Aleutian Range, including active volcanoes, glaciers, wild rivers, lakes, waterfalls, and alpine meadows in their natural state; and to protect habitat for and populations of fish and wildlife including but not limited to caribou, Dall sheep, brown/grizzly bears, bald eagles, and peregrine falcons.

(b) No lands conveyed to the Nondalton Village Corporation shall be considerd to be within the boundaries of the pard or preserve; if the corporation desires to convey any such lands, the Secretary may acquire such lands with the consent of the owner, and any such lands so acquired shall become part of the park or preserve, as appropriate. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park were such uses are traditional in accordance with the provisions of title VIII.

* * * * * * *

(9) Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, containing approximately [eight million one hundred and forty-seven thousand acres of public lands, and Wrangell-Saint Elias National Preserve, containing approximately four million one hundred and seventy-one thousand acres of public lands, as generally depicted on map numbered WRST-90,007, and dated August 1980.] *Five million eight hundred twenty-five thousand acres of public lands, and Wrangell-Saint Elias National Preserve, containing approximately six million four hundred ninety-three thousand acres of public lands, as generally depicted on map numbered AK-1000, and dated August 10, 1982, which shall be on file and available for inspection in the offices of the Secretary.* The park and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To maintain unimpaired the scenic beauty and quality of high mountain peaks, foothills, glacial systems, lakes, and streams, valleys, and coastal landscapes in their natural state; to protect habitat for, and populations of, fish and wildlife including but not limited to caribou, brown/grizzly bears, Dall sheep, moose, wolves, trumpeter swans and other waterfowl, and marine mammals; and to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access for mountain climbing, mountaineering, and other wilderness recreational activities. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the park, where such uses are traditional, in accordance with the provisions of title VIII.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 202. * * *

* * * * * * *

(3)(a) Mount McKinley National Park, by the addition of an area containing approximately [two million four hundred and twenty-six thousand acres of public land, and approximately one million three hundred and thirty thousand acres of additional public land is hereby established as Denali National Preserve, both as generally depicted on map numbered DENA-90,007, and dated July 1980] *nine hundred thousand acres of public land, and approximately two million eight hundred fifty-six thousand acres of additional public land is hereby established as Denali National Preserve, both as generally depict-*

ed on map numbered AK-1000, and dated August 10, 1982, which shall be on file and available for inspection in the offices of the Secretary and the whole is hereby redesignated as Denali National Park and Preserve. The park additions and preserve shall be managed for the following purposes, among others: To protect and interpret the entire mountain massif, and additional scenic mountain peaks and formations; and to protect habitat for, and populations of fish and wildlife including, but not limited to, brown/grizzly bears, moose, caribou, Dall sheep, wolves, swans and other waterfowl; and to provide continued opportunities, including reasonable access, for mountain climbing, mountaineering and other wilderness recreational activities. That portion of the Alaska Railroad right-of-way within the park shall be subject to such laws and regulations applicable to the protection of fish and wildlife and other park values as the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Transportation, may determine. Subsistence uses by local residents shall be permitted in the additions to the park where such uses are traditional in accordance with the provisions in title VIII.

(b) The Alaska Land use Council shall, in cooperation with the Secretary, conduct a study of the Kantishna Hills and Dunkle Mine areas of the park as generally depicted on a map entitled "Kantishna Hills/Dunkle Mine Study Area", dated October 1979, and report thereon to the Congress not later than three years from the date of enactment of this Act. The study and report shall evaluate the resources of the area, including but not limited to, fish and wildlife, public recreation opportunities, wilderness potential, historic resources, and minerals, and shall include those recommendations respecting resources and other relevant matters which the Council determines are necessary. In conjuction with the study required by this section, the Council, in consultation with the Secretary, shall compile information relating to the mineral potential of the areas encompassed within the study, the estimated cost of acquiring mining properties, and the environmental consequences of further mineral development.

(c) During the period of the study, no acquisition of privately owned land shall be permitted within the study area, except with the consent of the owner, and the holders of valid mining claims shall be permitted to operate on their claims, subject to reasonable regulations designed to minimize damage to the environment: *Provided, however,* That such lands or claims shall be subject to acquisition without the consent of the owner or holder if the Secretary determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, if such notice and hearing are not otherwise required by applicable law or regulation, that activities on such lands or claims will significantly impair important scenic, wildlife, or recreational values of the public lands which are the subject of the study.

* * * * * * *

○